THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 5. AUGUST, 1928. Vol. XVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Inherent Spiritual Rights.

The phrase 'the inherent spiritual rights of the Church' is fast becoming 'a blessed phrase' like 'the Divine Right of Kings' in the seventeenth century. At present it appears to be used in ecclesiastical circles to assert claims for the Church which cannot be justified at the bar of Reason, Scripture, and History. These inherent spiritual rights of the Church would appear in the minds of those who appeal to them to deprive Parliament of any moral right to refuse its sanction to the Deposited Book. Dr. Henson is calling Churchmen to arms to fight under the leadership of the Bishops against the iniquity of 'a tame Church in a secularized State.' What is really the cause of the trouble is not 'a tame Church in a secularized State' (the State has probably never been more Christian than it is to-day), but 'a Romanized Church in a Protestant State,' and the remedy for that is not to be found in Cavour's programme of 'a free Church in a free State,' but 'a Christian Church in a Christian State.' The spirit which is prompting some of the present talk about 'inherent spiritual rights' is the same spirit as that which prompted the Church policy of Gregory VII and Innocent III. It is spiritual pride, 'the pride of the Churchman' disguised as spiritual independence and a passion for

righteousness. Its martyr is St. Thomas à Becket of Canterbury. To be 'tame,' even if you are a Bishop, is not to be un-Christian. The Beatitude, 'Blessed are the meek,' would seem to commend the cultivation of 'tameness.' Canon Liddon was at particular pains on a notable occasion to show how the Religion of Jesus had ennobled the word ταπεινοφροσύνη, which in its classical and pagan environment suggested a slavish grovelling or pusillanimity, but which under the influence of the Spirit of Jesus had become that beautiful virtue Christian lowliness.

The Bishops knew they were exposing the Deposited Book to the gravest of risks when they sanctioned perpetual reservation in the chancels of parish churches: they knew they were challenging the Protestant spirit of the nation and of the majority of the Church laity. They felt it best to do so. They have lost. It would be infinitely better to take their defeat like sportsmen. In any case to attack Parliament because it has, after full debate, exercised those powers which the Church authorities agreed in the Enabling Act that it should exercise, seems hardly reasonable, and to demand greater freedom for the Church from the State seems as fatuous as to go to your banker after he has dishonoured two of your cheques and demand that he shall honour your blank cheque. If Dr. Henson would only think of the Church as *she*, we feel sure he would realize the need and duty of submission on *her* part. Meanwhile there is much fruitful work for the Bishops to do in their dioceses without their raising the barren constitutional issue. We need urgently a revised Prayer Book which leaves Eucharistic doctrine and practice severely alone. This Parliament would pass to-morrow. Dr. Henson himself pointed out some years ago that in the light of history the Scottish religious temperament is Ultramontane, but the English religious temperament is Erastian. If this be so, can anything but disaster ensue if our leaders undertake a Hildebrandine campaign. Financially of course they will not suffer; it is their ruined successors who will bear the loss in their semi-detached villas, and the long-suffering and disgruntled laity in the poorer town and country parishes who will be deprived of resident incumbents. This reflection should cause Dr. Henson to hesitate. *Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*

Dr. Temple's Diagnosis.

Dr. Temple, in his July letter to the Manchester diocese, writes :

> 'We have to recognise the fact that there is a real alienation for the moment between the Church and a great mass of the people. From this it could be argued that the Church has failed in its task of winning or holding the people, and must be regarded as having forfeited confidence. Or it might be argued that there has been a double process at work, the Church setting a higher standard in the devotional life, while the majority have been making less and less of religious observance. Probably there is more than a little truth in both those conclusions.
>
> 'But the question of greatest importance is this : are we to regard the existing alienation as an episode or as the result of tendencies which will take many generations to work themselves out? If the latter is the truth, then even those who (like myself) set a very high value on the Establishment of the Church as a principle, might feel that the reality is out of it, and that Disestablishment will alone suffice to make our system correspond with the spiritual facts. On the other hand, it must be recognised that at a time of peculiarly deep stirring of men's thoughts about life and religion, such divergencies and alienations as I have described are for the time inevitable, while they may easily come to a reconciliation when the period of stabilisation sets in again.'

Those who know much of the true state of affairs are only too painfully aware of this 'real alienation' between the Church and the great mass of the people. The *Church Times* puts the situation with admirable brevity :

> 'The truth is, of course, that the English Church is Catholic and the English nation is not.'

The remedy for the situation from the *Church Times*' point of view is equally clear and straightforward :

> 'It is the mission of the English Church to teach the English people the Catholic religion.'

Of course when the English people accepts the Catholic religion, as the *Church Times* understands it, all will be well. But is there the remotest prospect that the English people ever will do so? We are compelled to answer, 'None.' Meanwhile the disastrous but well-intentioned effort to use the English Church to teach the 'Catholic religion'—really Romanism without the Pope—is having a most disastrous effect upon the English Church, and will ultimately have an even more disastrous effect on the moral and spiritual character of the English nation. Normal Englishmen, neither freaks nor fanatics, whether of the

public school or of the artizan class, seem to be silently withdrawing, the former from the ministry, the latter from the congregation. Yet the amount of *diffused* Christianity has probably never been greater in this country, nor has there ever been a clearer national understanding of the essential character of the Christian religion—and that understanding prevents rather than assists what the *Church Times* understands by the 'conversion of England.'

In his luminous *History of England*, when dealing with the ecclesiastical effects of the Norman Conquest, Professor G. M. Trevelyan writes:

> 'But the changes effected by the foreign churchmen meant also the further Latinization of religion in ways not permanently endurable to the Nordic temper and genius' (p. 128).

It is this Latinization which the Anglo-Catholic movement has carried to such an extraordinary degree in the English Church. Had the same amount of energy and self-sacrifice been put into the Christianization and modernization of the English Church, the alienation between Church and people, of which the episcopate are becoming aware, would not only have been checked, but, we dare to think, very largely remedied. If we are to continue to have an increasingly Latinized National Church, its effect will be to create in our centres of population great groups of secularists and little bands of clericalists, and in the end lead to the substitution of a Pagan culture for the essentially Christian culture which still exists but is struggling for survival against almost overwhelming odds, since in too many cases its official exponents and defenders are becoming unwittingly its most deadly enemies.

For the English Church in the present crisis there is no standing still. There are two, and only two, conversions possible, a conversion to Catholicism (in the *Church Times*' sense), or a conversion to Modernism (not of the Roman but the English type). If the latter conversion be achieved, the English Church will enter on a beneficial period of expanding influence for good. If, however, the former be pursued, the Church's mission as a national force will cease, although its adherents may live to see its Primate exhibiting the *pallium* not simply on his coat-armour, but on his breast.

Dr. Goudge and the Ultimate Christian Authority.

In a recent letter to the *Times*, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford dealt with the ultimate authority for the Christian. Canon Goudge's four main theses were as follows:

(1) 'To a Christian there can be but one ultimate authority, the authority of God in Christ.'

(2) 'When circumstances arise with which the words of Christ do not directly deal . . . the Spirit of Christ, dwelling in those who accept Him as their Lord and Saviour, must interpret His mind.'

(3) 'The individual Christian must seek for the enlightenment of his conscience by the corporate conscience of the Church of which he is a member.'

(4) 'When our Lord gave authority to the Church to interpret His will, He *ipso facto* denied that authority to any other body; and the Church itself cannot give to the House of Commons an authority which Christ denies to it.'

Theses (1) and (2) are accepted by all Christians. Thesis (3), if 'must seek' means 'must accept the Church's verdict,' comes into conflict with the right of private judgment as maintained by the Reformed Churches, including of course the English Church. That right is well expressed in the words of the judicious Hooker:

> '"Companies of learned men," be they never so great and reverend, are to yield unto reason; the weight whereof is no whit prejudiced by the simplicity of his person which doth allege it, but being found to be sound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary must of necessity stoop and give place.'

Hence in a dispute between a Church and an individual, we must not assume that the Church is *necessarily* right. Even General Councils, as Article XXI asserts, may err. All we can affirm in this matter is that Jesus promises Divine Inspiration to His disciples—and by disciples He plainly meant those whose deeds proved their discipleship (cf. *Mt.* vii, 16, 21—23; *Jn.* xiii, 35)—but this conditional promise of inspiration, while it renders progressive illumination possible, prevents Christians from claiming infallibility for any particular decision. They may believe the decision to be inspired, but they must always be prepared in the light of fuller knowledge and growing experience to revise it or even reverse it.

Thesis (4) assumes that Christ's promise of inspiration is *exclusive*. This is fundamentally unsound. Can we imagine

the guidance of the Spirit being withheld from one who, although outside the Christian Church, yet humbly sought to know and to do the Divine Will? 'Of a truth,' said the amazed St. Peter, 'I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him' (*Acts* x, 34*f.*) Jesus nowhere in His Gospel limits the operation of the Spirit of Truth to a particular community, and an open-minded study of the history of human thought shows that there has been no such limitation. 'The Spirit bloweth where it listeth.' If this be so, to argue that an inspiration conditionally vouchsafed to the Church Assembly is denied to the House of Commons is entirely fallacious.

An Attempt to end Eucharistic Strife.

Both religious and irreligious persons are weary to death of sacramental controversy, but that is no reason why it should cease while unwelcome sacramental practices and irritating sacramental teaching are being forced on long-suffering parishioners in their parish churches.

The Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, plainly feeling that ignorance of the distinctive eucharistic teaching of the Church of England is at the root of the evil, passed by 18 votes to 3, at their session on July 11th, the following resolution moved by Dr. Headlam and supported by Dr. Barnes:

> 'That a committee of Bishops be appointed to prepare for the consideration of the Bishops a draft statement of the teaching of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and that they have authority to consult the Commission on Doctrine and other theologians of the Anglican Communion.'

A few weeks ago the authorities of the English Church Union, the Federation of Catholic Priests, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, put forth the following eucharistic declaration signed by 2,202 priests of the provinces of Canterbury and York:

> In view of the grave unsettlement of mind which has been caused by recent discussions of Eucharistic doctrines, we, the undersigned priests of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, declare our belief as follows:—
>
> 1. We believe that in the Holy Eucharist the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ by virtue of the Prayer of Consecration, and that therefore He Himself is truly present under these outward forms.

2. We believe that the Body and Blood of our Lord thus truly present are offered to the Father as a sacrifice; that this sacrifice is one with the Sacrifice of the Cross; and that it is the continual commemoration of our Lord's Death and Resurrection, and the continual application of His merits.

3. We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, being therefore truly and personally present in the Consecrated Sacrament, is therein to be adored; and that inward and outward acts of adoration are due to Him in the Liturgy after the Consecration.

4. We believe also that our Lord is no less present in the Sacrament when reserved; and therefore is therein always to be adored with like acts of adoration.

This declaration does not seem to us to differ materially from the eucharistic doctrine contained in the Declaration of Faith sent in June, 1924, to the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, and signed by some three thousand Anglican clergymen, including Bishop Gore, in which the signatories declared that they have received Apostolic Orders through their Bishops with the purpose that

'We should offer the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharist for both the living and the departed. We hold that by consecration the bread and wine are changed and become the true Body and Blood of Christ, and we hold that Christ, thus present, is to be adored.'

It was of this teaching that the Jesuit, Fr. Woodlock, wrote that

'It does represent the Pre-Reformation belief in England. It also represents the belief of the Catholic Church to-day. But to call it the historic witness of the Anglican Communion during the last 375 years, or to say that it is the expression of the official Anglican faith to-day, is to state what simply is not a fact.'

With these facts in view, two questions naturally arise: (1) Will the statement on eucharistic teaching, which it is proposed to make, bring out clearly and strongly the conflict between the Reformation doctrine of the Eucharist and the Pre-Reformation doctrine, which caused the death of Archbishop Cranmer and the other Marian martyrs? (2) When such a statement is put forth will it carry any weight at all with the two or three thousand English clergymen who have signed these declarations? Do they want to know or would they accept as authoritative the distinctive Anglican teaching on the Eucharist? We very much doubt it.

There are four things which characterize the Church of England doctrine of the Eucharist, which, we hope, the proposed statement will put clearly and strongly. (1) It denies *the Miracle*

of the Mass. No miraculous change takes place in the eucharistic elements as the result of the proper pronouncement of the formula of consecration by the priest. (2) It denies the *Expiatory Sacrifice of the Mass*. When the Holy Communion is celebrated there is no repetition of Christ's sacrifice by which expiation is made for the sins of the living and the dead. (3) It prohibits the adoration of the consecrated elements as 'Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.' (4) It reserves the term Mass for the Roman rite, which it regards as erroneous and idolatrous, and calls the Reformed rite the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.

Dean Rashdall complained that:

> 'The great defect of much religious teaching at the present day is that it treats as simple and obvious things that are by no means simple and obvious, while it turns into difficult and unintelligible mysteries things which are really very simple and intelligible.'

Nowhere is this more conspicuous than in eucharistic doctrine. We offer an illustration from recent experience. At a 'Fraternal' of English clergymen and Free Church ministers, an Anglican vicar read a paper on 'The Sacramental Principle.' At its conclusion a scholarly Methodist minister said: 'Probably all will agree with what has been said about the sacramental principle, but we need to understand its implications and applications. Will our Anglican brother answer the following questions?

(1) 'When you pronounce the formula of consecration over the sacramental bread, does a change take place?'
The Anglican answered, 'Yes.'

(2) 'If I pronounce the same formula do you believe that a change takes place?'
The Anglican answered, 'No.'

(3) 'Does the change take place because of your superior morality?'
The Anglican answered, 'Certainly not.'

(4) 'Is it then because of your superior spirituality?'
The Anglican answered, 'Certainly not.'

(5) 'If that be so, why then does our Anglican brother object to Bishop Barnes calling the change magical?'
This led to a really vital discussion.

We hope our theologians will really produce a clear, brief, courageous statement that laymen can understand and receive, and which can be taught to our confirmees and ordinands. In this matter, as in all doctrinal teaching to-day, we need the truth and not tradition, unless tradition can be shown to be true.

THE DEMAND FOR THE RELIGIOUS NOVEL.

The offer of a prize of £1,000 by an astute publisher, for the unpublished manuscript of the best religious novel, testifies to the interest of the public in religion if it be sufficiently exciting and unconventional. The offer has naturally led would-be competitors and others to ask: What is a religious novel? This, we gather, is not quite an easy question to answer when we find well-known persons speaking of the *Morte d'Arthur*, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Ben Hur* as novels. A novel must be prose fiction in the form of a life-like narrative of events or experiences: epic poetry, drama, allegory, fable, dialogue are therefore excluded from the category, and so such creations as *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *Rasselas*. A novel must, according to modern ideas, be long enough to make a book: this excludes the tale or short story. It must contain 'a dominating love interest': this excludes such books as *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Treasure Island*, and *Ben Hur*. The *Morte d'Arthur* constitutes a problem in classification. It is a romance of chivalry —or rather a national prose epic. Mallory arranged and embellished the legends, but he is not their creator, and in this his work differs widely from Scott's *Ivanhoe*, a genuine novel.

But what makes a novel religious? Is it sufficient that it should deal with a religious theme—religious personages and happenings? Hardly. It is not necessary that the subject be religious, but the writer must treat it as one conscious of religious realities. But a better way of estimating whether a novel is religious is not by its contents—either subject or treatment—but by its effects. The religious novel stimulates in its readers the sense of the numinous—and for Englishmen the numinous is profoundly moral. The English religious novel, like tragedy, purges the reader's mind.

> 'The tidal wave of deeper souls
> Into his inmost being rolls,
> And lifts him unawares
> Out of all meaner cares.'

As he reads he enters the Holy of Holies; he has a vision of things celestial; he becomes alive in his environment to spiritual presences and possibilities. Like the Hebrew patriarch in the stony vale of Bethel, he exclaims: 'This is none other than the

House of God, and this the Gate of Heaven.' The great religious novel should awaken its reader to the perception of 'the things eternal,' 'the things that lie too deep for tears,' 'the hands stretched out in longing for the farther shore,' 'things, the good of which, and the use of which, are beyond all calculation of worldly goods and earthly uses.' Juliana Horatia Ewing's *Jackanapes*, if it were not 'the short story,' has all the other qualities of the great religious novel. Joseph Shorthouse's *John Inglesant*, losing something in quality for what it gains in quantity, is a noble example. But the number of English religious novels is really very great. People, if they know them, which we greatly doubt, smile to-day at Charlotte Yonge's religious novels; yet even great judges in her day were deeply affected by her books, and they did not a little to promote the Tractarian Movement. Charles Kingsley's *Westward Ho!*, *Hypatia*, and *Alton Locke* did as much to inspire English Protestantism, and stand very much higher as literature. George Eliot's greatest novels, *The Mill on the Floss* and *Adam Bede*, are deeply religious. But perhaps when all else she wrote has been forgotten, *Scenes from Clerical Life*—and, most moving of all, *Janet's Repentance*—will be read and remembered: yet their size hardly entitles them to the dignity of novels.

Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, besides being a great historical novel, is also a great religious novel. Of Dickens' novels, *A Tale of Two Cities* and *The Old Curiosity Shop* might be claimed as religious. Mrs. Humphry Ward's *Robert Elsmere* is perhaps a theological rather than a religious novel, as is also *Richard Meynell*. Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh* deserves to be ranked as a great religious novel—it is a work both of religious revolt and of religious construction, with its reputation yet to come. Of older religious novels, Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* and Mrs. Craik's *John Halifax: Gentleman* rank high. Of American novels in the English tongue, Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, O. W. Holmes' *Elsie Venner*, Winston Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup*, and James Lane Allen's *The Increasing Purpose* (though some might put higher *The Choir Invisible* by the same author) seem to us to be really religious. But the more we think of English religious novels the more numerous they seem to be, and the

more difficult to draw the line. Are the novels of the Brontës and Jane Austen not religious? Few constant readers of them would dare to answer in the negative. We might as well affirm that Shakespeare's plays are not religious because they are non-theological and unecclesiastical.

Charles Kingsley, a man of enthusiasms rather than moods, singled out *The Fool of Quality*, by Henry Brooke, published in 1766-70, and wrote the Preface to a new edition which he concluded thus:

> 'Go forth once more, brave book, as God shall speed thee: and wherever thou meetest, whether in peasant or in peer, with a royal heart, tender and true, magnanimous and chivalrous, enter in and dwell there; and help its owner to become (as thou canst help him) a Man, a Christian, and a Gentleman . . .'

The novel that can do that may be called rightly 'a religious novel'; but will anyone write it in order to win a prize of £1,000?

Eastern Orthodoxy, Liberal Islam, and Ourselves.

The desire of English Churchmen to promote closer relations with the Greek Churches is entirely Christian, but there seem to be certain disadvantages connected with its realization. It is separating us from the Liberal Jew and from the Liberal Muslim. This seems a very serious matter to modern-minded English Christian missionaries in the East. If our relations with the Orthodox Churches are of such a kind that we seem to be identifying the Christian Religion with what the Muslim and the Jew regard as frankly superstitious and idolatrous, then we may as well cease making any attempt to carry on propagandist Christian work among them. The issue we are dealing with is raised by a letter from which we give the following extracts. The writer is an English missionary of good standing:

> 'There is a lot in the liberal Muslim that does appeal. True he has given up going to mosque. One of the Friday preachers told a very senior missionary the other day that he was gratified if he got a congregation of twenty to listen to him. This cannot go on indefinitely, and Islam is drifting in the direction of materialism. But to be frank there is a great deal in the whole outlook of the Orthodox Churches out here that some of us find very hard to construe as Christian, and which Islam has connected for generations with her understanding of the word Christian. This again cannot go on indefinitely, even if it is being backed up at home by good people who simply do not know the facts of the case. Let me be more explicit. One of my greatest friends

> came out as a delegate to the International Missionary Council. One day I asked him how he liked the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. His reply was: 'It isn't Christian. I would rather be a liberally-minded Muslim.' Quite a lot of us really feel the same way. But the fact remains that, if at home people are going to put reunion with Orthodox unreformed Christianity first, it will hinder our approach to Islam and I believe, though with less ground for saying so, as I am not a member of the Jewish Missionary Society, to Judaism. It seems to me there are two radically different attitudes taken towards the Eastern Churches, and people at home are not helping the Eastern Churches with that attitude which is half-patronizing and half-worshipful. It is not so much the state of the Eastern Churches to-day that complicates our approach to the Muslim and the Jew as the attitude adopted towards them by many Anglicans both in England and when they come out here. What are we to do? Are we to go on allowing Islam and Jewry to think we still countenance as Christian what we know, and they know, is not? We want a lead. We want also the way explored for finding out the place where we can meet the Islam of the future with something helpful and constructive. We want too to know how far Jewry will come, suppose, for instance, we reverted to primitive second century Christianity. The path is, I know, thorny; but it would considerably help us all to know that there was a Christian public opinion in England which could express itself on this subject. We want to help the Eastern Churches, but this help must be hindrance if it means bolstering up what seems to many, as it has seemed to Islam and Judaism, to be idolatry. It is a strong word, but what other is there?'

The situation is one of great difficulty. To be ready to admit to the Holy Communion in English churches all Orthodox Christians who wish to communicate is as entirely right as it is to assist them educationally and philanthropically, but to give the impression either to them or to others that the Christianity of the English Church is to be identified with that Byzantine Christianity which was in no small degree responsible for the rise of Montheistic idol-hating Islam and collapsed before it, is a profound mistake.

Biblical Studies and their Extension.

All real advance out of our present ecclesiastical difficulties depends on the promotion of sound religious education. For British people the text-book of religious education must be the Bible. Although many excellent and inspiring books may be used to make the Bible comprehensible, and influential in the right way, there can be no substitute for the Bible. The National Church should be the great agent in Biblical education. That was the ideal of the Reformers, and it was their

intention that the cathedral chapters especially should be seats of Biblical learning. The great difficulty and danger of scientific Biblical studies has caused the Church to shrink from the task. With a few noble and notable exceptions, we cannot point to our cathedral dignitaries as either great Biblical scholars or great Biblical teachers. Many of the chapters do not contain even a single Biblical scholar of eminence. It has been left to the Universities and to clerical free lances like Major Povah, B.D., to promote modern Biblical studies among the laity. When our University Extension faculties included Biblical studies in their courses a great impulse was given to their promotion. It was Oxford, we believe, which led the way, but now, among the educated classes, London University particularly is doing great service through the operation of its Divinity Lectures Committee. In this connection we wish particularly to draw attention to the magazine of the movement, *The Bible and Religious Thought*,* edited by Dr. Naish and Miss M. S. West B.D. The contributors are of high standing and the articles interesting and well-informed. This new magazine takes the place to some extent of *The Interpreter* and *The Expositor*, both unhappily defunct.

Those who propose to promote Biblical studies in their locality will find full particulars of methods and activities in the magazine, and we hope also the inspiration to undertake the task. It is very important in every centre of population to have Biblical teaching up to the University level: it is the best antidote to obscurantism, sectarianism, and materialism.

*Issued half-yearly, single copies 1/1 post free. Published by G. Neal, 12 Patten Road, London, S.W.18.

RECENT CONTROVERSIES IN IRELAND

By the Rev. W. R. M. Orr, M.A., LL.D., Vicar of Gilford, Down.

THE political calm which has come over the face of Irish life within the last few years is not, it is to be feared, a certain indication that the Irish character has quite lost the pugnacity which is supposed to be one of its well-marked features. Recent events in the ecclesiastical realm supply some evidence to the contrary. Theology is still a very living subject in Ireland, and the combative spirit appears to find an outlet for its energies in the discussion of its profound problems.

During the last few years the Irish Presbyterian Church has been disturbed by a rather acute theological conflict—waged on one side at least with a polemical ardour reminiscent of similar encounters in days gone by. Irish Presbyterianism is on the whole very fairly representative of the dominant religious ideas of the Northern Province. In its origin it was the embodiment of the creed of the Scottish settlers in Ulster. The religion of Ulster has undoubtedly some excellent characteristics derived from the stock of Puritanism. The spirituality of the typical Ulsterman is deep-seated—the appeal of religion ever finds a ready response. He has a fixed repugnance to sacerdotalism in any form, and to such ceremonialism as would divert his attention from the inward to the outward in religious worship. But there are other legacies of Puritanism not so commendable. There is a strong vein of Calvinism in the religion of Ulster. A crude Evangelicalism still attracts the populace. Emotional 'Revivals,' usually conducted by American preachers, periodically sweep over the province, with very doubtful moral and spiritual results. Such 'Revivals' are always based upon a peculiarly retrograde theology. It is natural, therefore, that the obscurantist movement termed Fundamentalism should find a stronghold in Ulster. The avowed object of this movement, wherever it appears, is to check the advance of Modernist ideas. Modernism has been making rapid strides in Ulster within the last few years, and the Presbyterian Church has not escaped its influence. The younger clergy in particular have become

acquainted with the modern scientific outlook and the results of Biblical criticism. They feel the need of considerable restatement in theology. Whilst loyal to the basal principles of Presbyterianism, they cannot think to-day all the thoughts of those who compiled the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Fundamentalists are aware of this, and an organization styling itself 'The Bible Standards League'—consisting chiefly of laymen—has been formed to combat the growing Modernism of the Church. The campaign has been opened by an attack on what is regarded as the source of the evil—the teaching of the Theological Professors in the Assembly's College in Belfast. The battle is still in progress, but the first round has been fought out. Last year a serious charge of heresy was preferred in the General Assembly against Professor Davey. Dr. Davey's reputation as a scholar extends far beyond the limits of his own Church, and his book *The Changing Vesture of the Faith* is highly valued by the Christian Student Movement. The Professor was charged with teaching several heresies in contravention of the formularies. To substantiate the charges the usual method of taking isolated passages from his writings, and putting an invidious construction upon them, was adopted by the accusers. Not content with this, the Fundamentalists organized public meetings at the time of the trial to influence the mind of the populace against the Professors, representing them as dishonest men endeavouring to set aside the Bible and overthrow the foundations of Christianity. The General Assembly, however, to its great credit, calmly disregarded this agitation. By an overwhelming majority, Professor Davey was acquitted of the charges against him. This has been a severe defeat for the Fundamentalists. But it has not put an end to the agitation. And just recently the leaders of the Church have thought it politic to put aside a very reasonable proposal to modify the formula of subscription to the Confession of Faith.

The Episcopal Church of Ireland has not been altogether free from controversy within recent years. As Dean Stanley held, this Church is in essence the Anglican Church in Ireland, and in spite of the Disestablishment in 1869, it continues to maintain all the best traditions of Anglicanism. In particular it has the same broad and comprehensive basis that marks the

Church of England. Though moderate in their expression, Evangelical, Catholic, and Liberal Schools of thought co-exist within it. The political division of Ireland resulting from the establishment of the Irish Free State has in no way affected the unity of the Church, which still embraces the whole island. This is an immense advantage for the Church, as the very different religious temperaments of the North and of the South meet together within its pale, and afford a healthy counterpoise to one another. The clergy are as a body educated and cultured, and usually quite abreast of modern movements of thought. Fundamentalism does not find a congenial atmosphere in such a liberal Church. Yet some organizations exist which profess as their object the suppression of Modernism. A short time ago a charge of heresy was brought against the Rev. R. W. Seaver, B.D., Rector of Malone, Belfast, which has been already referred to in the *Modern Churchman*. Mr. Seaver is a Liberal Churchman of considerable scholarship and noted for his frank expression of opinion on religious subjects. He was charged with maintaining a number of opinions that are usually characterized as Modernist, in opposition to the Prayer-Book and the Articles. The Court of the General Synod is the supreme arbiter in matters of this kind, but there is a prior inquiry as to a *prima facie* case by a Commission appointed by the Archbishop of the Province; on the report of the Commission, the Archbishop and two lay Judges decide as to whether a trial should take place. In Mr. Seaver's case it was definitely decided that there was no *prima facie* case for trial. This decision is undoubtedly a very important one, as it obviously implies that the opinions held by Mr. Seaver have a quite legitimate place within the Church. We may point to it as a striking proof that the liberty afforded to clergymen in the Church of Ireland in the expression of their views is quite as wide as that which prevails within the Church of England.

Order and discipline in the conduct of public worship is, of course, a totally distinct matter, and a similar degree of liberty in this sphere could not be granted by the Church with safety. There has been a good deal of discussion amongst Irish Churchmen for some years past as to the wisdom of relaxing the Canons drawn up in 1870, which render illegal a number of ceremonies

valued by many Churchmen in public worship. It may be that these Canons are too stringent, and that some modification would be desirable. But whilst they exist, the Church authorities cannot be blamed for enforcing obedience to them. On this ground we can fully acquiesce in a noteworthy judgment of the Court of the General Synod, in a case recently brought before it, deciding as to the illegality of certain ceremonies used in a particular church and prohibiting their continuance. This judgment has caused great indignation in extreme Anglo-Catholic circles. An article in the *Church Times*, entitled 'A Church in Fetters,' speaks of 'the unhappy state' of the 'poor Irish Church,' pours contempt upon the General Synod and its Court, and asks for earnest prayer on the part of Catholics that 'this intolerable state of things may come to an end.' Irish Churchmen are not perturbed by such extravagant language. Even those of them who place a value on such ceremonies are, in most cases, willing to make a sacrifice of their own predilection for the sake of the great advantages of order and discipline in worship. The famous historian, Mr. Lecky, who was in favour of the utmost latitude of opinion in the Church of England, wrote as to its public worship:

> 'It is their (the ministers) first duty to celebrate public worship in such a form that all members of the Church of England may be able to join in it. Whatever interpretations may be placed upon the ceremonies of the Church, those ceremonies, at least, should be substantially the same. A stranger who enters a church which he has never before seen should be able to feel that he is certain of finding public worship intelligibly and decently performed, as in past generations it has been celebrated in all sections of the Established Church. It has, in my opinion, been a gross scandal, following a gross neglect of duty, that this primary obligation has been defied, and that services are held in English churches which would have been almost unrecognisable by the churchmen of a former generation, and which are manifest attempts to turn the English public worship into an imitation of the Romish Mass' (*The Map of Life*).

In truth there are no fetters upon Irish Churchmen except those required by the necessities of the corporate life of the Church. Some time ago an article in this journal described the ideal condition of the Church as consisting in 'A Free Pulpit and a Prescribed Liturgy.' We may justly claim that the Church of Ireland not only aims at, but at the present moment approaches very nearly to this ideal.

There is indeed one Church in Ireland, larger and more influential than all the rest, which is undisturbed by any controversies either about doctrine or ritual. The great Roman Catholic Church presents a spectacle of dignified repose which, as contrasted with the discord of Protestantism, seems very attractive to some superficial minds. The pretence of Infallibility, even though it may rest upon a very precarious foundation, has, it may be admitted, *some* advantages in ecclesiastical life. But for those who put the interests of Truth before all other considerations, the evils of noisy controversy are infinitely to be preferred to those of a peaceful torpor resulting from the complete suppression of thought. Lord Macaulay wrote :

> 'Nobody loves discrepancy for the sake of discrepancy. But a person who conscientiously believes that free inquiry is, on the whole, beneficial to the interests of truth, and that, from the imperfection of the human faculties, wherever there is much free inquiry there will be some discrepancy, may, without impropriety, consider such discrepancy, though in itself an evil, as a sign of good' (*Gladstone on Church and State*).

Controversy is the price—after all the very small price—which we have to pay for the inestimable pearl of Freedom.

MODERNISM AS AN EVANGELISTIC FORCE

By the Rev. R. G. Griffith, M.A.

BEFORE declaring 'No trumps' it is well to take stock of one's hand. Before we declare that Modernism is an Evangelistic Force we must be able to see how to make the necessary tricks. What then are the facts which give us confidence as Modernists? Personal experience whether as a parish priest or in the common way of life in contact with our fellows assuredly proves to many of us that 'the outstanding need of to-day is for a liberal outpouring of the spirit of common-sense, combined with a simpler faith in the essentially religious nature of the ordinary man.' So Maurice Pryke wrote in 'Modernism a Working Faith.' But it is well to beware of seeing in our own experience only what we want to see, and of interpreting what we do see clearly according to our own natural bias. There are none so blind as those who will not see, and facts like cabbages can be cooked. A glance or two at things outside the camp of

the Modernists of the Church of England may therefore be profitable.

We have been told by Mr. Shepherd, of the S.P.G., that there are signs in China of a Modernist spirit, though he himself since his return to England is inclined to think that Modernism may do more to clear the ground for an evangel than it is likely to do as an evangel. It is interesting then to learn that in other missionary societies such as the London Missionary Society a very distinct change in outlook has occurred of late years. In days gone by the new men with broader views upset 'the old hands' who complained that these new men had no gospel. Some of the older men have even come out on the liberal side themselves. Higher criticism has been found to be of great value in showing that the processes of examination applied to the Old Testament should also be applied to the Koran. In short, Dr. Garvie, who kindly gave me his views based on very wide experience, indicated that the flood of liberal thought is steadily penetrating the recesses of the mission field. This is not to say that advanced views are held by many missionaries, but only that the general tendency is in the direction of the best liberal scholarship and of its assured results. Bishop Colenso made his stand little more than half a century ago, so that his principles have been taken aboard of the good ship of orthodoxy with encouraging promptitude.

In another direction, though still *à propos* the mission-field, the work of Professor Albert Schweitzer in Equatorial Africa encourages those who long for the complete permeation of all Church activities by the spirit of Modernism.

As regards the trend of opinion amongst Christian people generally the newspapers give evidence of a strong feeling that liberal thought is essential to the life of the various religious bodies in England. Here are a few samples. The *Observer* of April 22nd, in an appreciation of the work of the Rev. B. J. Snell, a Congregationalist minister of fifty years experience, gives extracts from his remarks. 'The dominating conviction with us at the present moment is that to keep the way open for religion to the minds and hearts of men, there must be intellectual probity on the part of the Churches and those who speak in the name of the Churches. That means freedom from the gyves of subscription to the tenets and formulas of the past.'

And again: 'I believe,' he says, 'that the desire for truth is stronger and more widespread to-day than at any time during the past fifty years.' At the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England held on May 7th the Moderator, the Rev. Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson, surveyed the present position of religion, and whilst maintaining that the general public was very deeply interested in the subject, more so than was always recognized, is reported in *The Times* to have said that 'to meet the spirit of intellectual freedom in the present age the Churches must show themselves more hospitable to all facts. The facts which the scientist found in Nature were as truly God facts as were those which the theologian found in the Bible. No man was a wholly believing man, and no Church a wholly believing Church that could not say that. In the Presbyterian Church to-day there was, especially among the younger ministers, a real honesty and frankness of mind in dealing with all truth; but the Christian ministry as a whole had not yet won from the intelligent hearing of to-day that reputation for saying a thing for no other reason than that it was true, which men of science had.' On the day following the annual Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales met at the City Temple. In the course of the address from the chair the Rev. F. Wrigley, whose ministry lies in Leeds, struck the note of faith in liberal theology. 'The Church,' he said, 'should be grateful to all the scholars and discoverers who, by their passionate love of truth and their intellectual genius and their unceasing toil, had opened out to them those vast vistas of knowledge, and their plain duty was to adjust their theology, at whatever cost of pain and prejudice, to those new revelations that had won general assent, and to rejoice in another triumph of light over darkness . . . All of us know how the old view of the Bible, the old doctrine of verbal inspiration, has played havoc with the faith of the younger generation, and it is a task of urgency that our young people should be put in possession of the key that will unlock the real meaning and the real value of the sacred book, liberating its central message from all that is accidental and temporary and outworn.'

A member of the Churchmen's Union in reading such extracts and the whole of the contexts from which they are taken

infers without hesitation that his own belief in the necessity for liberal ways of thought and teaching is sound. For it is not isolated but proves to be typical. There is no need to stress or illustrate the needs which members of our own union feel. Dr. Major's lectures delivered in Harvard University upon the subject of 'English Modernism: Its Origin, Methods, Aims,' and now published in book form, must be familiar to us all and sum up our position. We feel from our own experience that liberal thought is essential. I submit that our hand is strong enough for a call of 'No trumps,' to retain our original metaphor, and further that if partner has anything to back us up with we are not unjustified in hoping for a grand slam!

Now we must inquire as to the kind of response which the general religious public makes to liberal teaching. For it is not always the case that people are satisfied with the gift for which they have been clamouring. The Traditionalist cries out that the Modernist is a thief who takes away the cherished heirlooms. There is a deep scepticism about this complaint. The Traditionalist does not realise that 'God fulfils Himself in many ways.' He in a sense appears to think that God is only as great as the particular conception of Him which he has comprehended. He regards God almost as an idol which can be uprooted and destroyed. If the authorship of a Gospel is disputed, he fears that God is therefore further from him in his spiritual life. If the miraculous props to faith are removed he dreads lest his faith should be unable to survive the loss. Nor is his view a purely selfish one. He fears lest the rising generation should grow up in infidelity. He identifies Christianity with the particular form familiar to himself, misunderstanding the phrase 'the faith once and for all delivered to the saints.' As the teaching of the Church has been for the most part traditionalist, the ordinary church-going public is traditionalist in outlook. But t does not follow that the average traditionalist congregation will be really upset or offended by modern teaching, however unfamiliar it may be. In fact experience would seem to indicate that the traditionalist congregations are relieved at liberal teaching. Suppressed doubts and difficulties, which many lay folk would not expect to be treated sympathetically by the clergy, are removed to the relief of the hearers. It is often forgotten

too in this connexion that the faith of old-fashioned people is far stronger than is always supposed. Some are afraid of upsetting them by tearing down old forms of belief. Now people who have lived for any length of time in communion with God, and have known His power in their lives, are not going to lose faith because ideas of inspiration, for example, are set before them in a new light. Those, on the other hand, whose faith, so-called, lies in a miraculous and wonder-working deity, have seldom attained to the spiritual gospel of Christianity, or, if they have, will be able to drop the husk of the purely marvellous and retain the kernel of the spiritual. Nor are we without warrant for this line of reasoning. Our Lord cast his seed broadly knowing that the good soil would receive it. He refused to give miraculous or marvellous sanctions, though the people asked for them. He insisted again and again that the appeal must be moral and spiritual and not other.

But further than this the way in which elderly folk have been led to see the beauty of the liberal outlook in spite of traditionalist upbringing and consequent beliefs, gives the Modernist complete confidence in his message.

With the young who attend church the case is simplicity itself. They take to Modernism like ducks to water. There is only one danger, and that is lest they should not be taught that freedom of thought and faith in God go hand in hand. The divine call for outspoken and systematic teaching along scientific and modern lines is urgent. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that empty churches are the result of old-fashioned modes of thought as much as anything, and in asserting emphatically that Modernism has with young people a tremendous appeal, and almost the only appeal. I do not recall a single instance of a child or young man or woman of my acquaintance who has been repelled by Modernism, though in fairness I must not claim a good memory. On the other hand I recall countless instances of intense interest and steady enthusiasm for Modernism amongst children and young people.

There is only one thing to be said about the way in which Modernism can win young people. Teaching must be unreserved. The clergy who take the young people completely into their confidence win them. But all trimming and supposed

diplomacy in dealing gingerly with vexed questions merely breeds suspicion and perhaps earns contempt. The miraculous generally, our Lord's birth and Resurrection in particular, are discussed by young people. The man who refuses to face the facts or to inquire fearlessly into them does not understand the meaning of true reverence. The young instinctively feel this.

Amongst older people, who are not Church members, there is much for Modernism to do. The Bishop of Birmingham has told us of the wistful agnostics whom he has come across. The ordinary parish priest too knows them well enough. They are often the sort of people who set the rest of us excellent examples of unselfishness in life. These ought to be in the Church, as much perhaps for the good of the Church as for themselves; they generally are very glad in their hearts to find that Modernism can break down the barriers and make them welcome.

If someone says that it hardly seems necessary to evangelize such people, one would reply that the purpose of the Church is served much more by the creation of a healthy spiritual atmosphere, which all sorts and conditions may breathe without conscious effort, than by the definite and conscious attempt to win over individuals, who may appear to be in great spiritual need. The type of good man whom I have in mind is the test of the healthiness of our Church atmosphere. Individuals in personal and immediate need will also find their life in such an atmosphere, which has an attraction for all.

This leads on to a further consideration. The type of mind which is greatly concerned with details of sacramental worship is not the normal amongst English people. Something like 99 per cent. of English people hold exactly the same ideas about the Holy Communion that the Reformers held. They shrink from approaching it without the deepest reverence. They find God at the service, but they settle instinctively all niceties of explanation without any deliberate effort. They can understand God being incarnate in human flesh, but the idea of God being localized in bread and wine they reject as idolatrous. Long words and long explanations make them impatient. Anglo-Catholicism with all its enthusiasms will never capture more than the 1 per cent. of the nation which has the outlook of the Middle ages. To be true to the Middle Ages is, I believe, what

is claimed; if it is not so, may the above remark be pardoned, because it is not intended to be offensive. Anglo-Catholicism is the only other serious competitor for the heart of the nation to-day, but its methods and ways of thought are out of date. Without seeking battle with it, Modernism will never make a completely effective appeal to the nation unless it approaches the sacraments in the same open-minded way that it approaches all other religious questions. Whilst respecting the convictions of the Catholic-minded care needs to be shown that the typical Modernist teaches the deeper and spiritual view of the Holy Communion, and is able to show from every point of view, including that of the learned scholar, that *ex opere operato* doctrines limit the conception of God and are relics of a more primitive age. For the only places, where elaborate theories and practices flourish, are those parishes which are not compelled to study the mass of parishioners, and can rely upon the support of a congregation drawn from larger areas. The nation is radically and irrevocably Protestant, though in view of the way in which the adjective is sometimes used in a rather contemptuous tone, one may better say the same thing by substituting the word Modernist. For the Modernist of to-day is the lineal descendant of the Reformer. He appeals to the learning and modes of thought of his own times, rather than to the tradition of the past, though he gives full weight to its importance but in due proportion only.

On still more general lines, too, it is obvious that Modernism attracts where Catholicism repels. The former appeals to the reason and to common-sense. People are led to accept our conclusions for the same reasons that we have come to them, namely, that they fit the facts. Catholicism overawes the intellect by appeals to the vastness of its claims. Such methods never succeed in England.

In discussion with a gentleman who had full knowledge of the correspondence in the *Daily Express* upon the subject of religion, which took place some little time ago, I learnt that the number of letters was so great as to defy the efforts of the staff to deal with them. There is and always will be interest in religion amongst all classes of people. But my informant gave it as his opinion that a new message was required. A Wesley or a Luther

was needed. Vast numbers were wandering like the prodigal son. When asked about the Modernist presentation of religion, which prefers the regular to the miraculous, he answered that it would help.

Now it is not at all certain that novelty is the great need. There is more than a little truth in the old saying that whatever is new is not true. Spiritual needs are like bodily needs very much the same at all times. But just as we make a meal of real food and not of the shop window dummy, so the spirit needs reality to feed it. Sincerity in the preacher is the first necessity for an effective gospel, for without it he will not be trusted. Any trimming, in the supposed interests of the hearers, presupposes omniscience as to the hearers' minds, or something like it, on the part of the preacher. He must be content to give the very best attempt at truth of which he is capable and leave the results to God. And quite apart from the message, which he gives, he will at least present to his hearers a truthful messenger. Professor Case of Chicago reminds us that 'unschooled men from the common walks of life are much more susceptible to the power of personal contacts than they are to the more abstract influence of academic indoctrination.' Modernism does have this influence upon the 'unschooled men from the common walks of life.' The Modernist says what he thinks, and is perfectly willing to admit truth from any quarter.

Now this attitude immediately stimulates all classes of people from school children upwards. A lesson, which is a voyage of discovery, undertaken by teacher and taught alike, is always one of interest and ends all too soon. But a lesson which merely employs the memory in storing up what the Church teaches, fails to hold the attention of healthy children and wastes their natural talent of curiosity, which may turn to other sources of interest such as the happenings in the next class or outside the window. The method of Christ is the method of the Modernist. He made use of men's powers of observation and of curiosity in parable and question. The method of Modernism is old and new: old in that it makes use of the ordinary human faculties, which do not change, and new in that it is ever making use of fresh knowledge.

Maurice Pryke quoted the Bishop of Durham to the effect

that 'the preacher who is inwardly convinced of the truth of the "new learning" must at whatever cost of embarrassment and unpopularity bring his teaching into harmony with it, and leave the consequences in the hands of the God of Truth who may never be served by any form of falsehood' (Liberty of Prophesying, quoted by M. Pryke, *Modernism a Working Faith*, p. 158). And it is quite easy to see the way in which the gospel of truth wins souls for God. The old-fashioned method of winning individuals by violent appeals to their emotions—the Salvation Army does some effective work on these lines still, though it by no means confines its activities to such methods—is not the most lasting method of evangelizing the world. India to-day, for instance, has a totally different ideal of life from what it used to have. The charges made in Mother India have to be met, not by denying the Christian standard, but by the 'Tu quoque' argument of Father India. How has this change of outlook been brought about? Surely by the leavening of the lump. 'The consequences in the hands of God' have been great. Missionaries, aided by all the Christian Englishmen in India, may not have had great numbers of Church members to show in their statistics, but their lives have influenced the masses of India so that Christian ideals have become more popular. Similarly at home the writings of the Dean of St. Paul's, for example, are gradually bringing men to see that the Christian message is an intelligible one to the modern mind. I hazard the opinion that by far the greater part of the thinking people in the country pay attention to the Dean and to the Bishop of Birmingham, whereas the utterances of the Traditionalist leave it quite cold. For one must remember that ecclesiastically-minded people and churchy people have no monopoly of religion in the country. The churches are supposed to be empty. Perhaps they are very empty. But I am assured again and again that the heart of the nation is more interested in religion than ever before. Newspapers are not published for philanthropic but for commercial reasons, and yet they are brimming over with religious subjects, articles and correspondence, because their readers are interested in religion.

Modernism may not yet be filling churches, though there is good ground for stating that it tends to fill them in some cases,

but it is certainly leavening the lump. The old truths are being made new. A new harmony is being introduced into religion. In the swing of a professional golfer the whole of the available human frame and energy are applied to the purpose of hitting the ball far and straight. The duffer is ineffective because he is unable to apply all his power at the right time. He fails to time the ball, as the phrase goes. The stifling of the intellect in religion means a half-hearted stroke in religion like the duffer's in golf. Too many churches bear out the truth of this comparison. We may claim that the principles of Modernism set free the whole of a man's faculties for the purposes of religion and service of God. Modernism should then prove an effective evangelistic force on theoretical, as well as on the other evidential grounds, we have passed in review.

But the work of bringing home to the world the message which Modernism offers has to be faced as a practical undertaking. S. Paul speaks of being 'instant in season and out of season,' and Dean Vaughan paraphrased it, 'take your opportunities or make them.' The Anglo-Catholic is an example to us. He is unwearying in his efforts to win England for Catholicism. Our case is good, but a case, however good, does need stating. The scholarly book, the newspaper article, the sermon or address are all means which Modernists are using, but there is one other very profitable method of spreading modern knowledge amongst ordinary people. I refer to the Church Tutorial Classes. Major Povah has already supplied readers of the *Modern Churchman* with leaflets explaining the work of the C.T.C.A. If further information is needed, 16 Russell Square is the source from which to obtain it. It only remains to testify to the wonderful opportunity, which a course of lessons under the system supplies for putting the facts of the present knowledge before people and for them to ask questions where they are befogged. I can conceive of no finer work for members of our union to undertake than that of organizing and conducting such classes, or at least in helping to initiate them all over the country. There is reason to believe that the movement is growing and will grow increasingly in the next few years. I submit that Modernism is *the* evangelistic force of to-day, and that the call to put it to the proof is divine.

STEPHEN LANGTON: PRIMATE AND PATRIOT

By Mary Bradford Whiting.

WHEN Tacitus, in the first century A.D., described the inhabitants of Britain, he credited the national character with a trait which, notwithstanding successive invasions from the Continent, may still be claimed for it after the lapse of eighteen centuries : the Britons, he says, combine a deep respect for Law with an intense love of Freedom.* These apparently incompatible characteristics are still firmly rooted in our race, and it is from them that the best qualities of the Englishman are born.

In Stephen Langton, the seven hundredth anniversary of whose death has just been celebrated, these two characteristics were strikingly developed; all through his career he was the champion of Freedom, yet he never championed Freedom at the expense of Law. An Englishman born, patriotic and loyal, he was forced to oppose his Sovereign; a devoted Churchman, elected to his high office by the Pope, he was driven into collision with that very spiritual authority to which he had vowed obedience; yet from both these conflicts he emerged successful and proved to his fellow-countrymen that Law is the best protector of Freedom and that Freedom is the lineal descendant of Law.

The place of Langton's birth is disputed and its date is doubtful. Little is known of his early life; but his father, Henry de Langton, came from Langton in Lincolnshire, and his education was finished in Paris, where he became Doctor both of Arts and Theology. An office holder in the University of Paris and a Prebend of York Minster, he was summoned to Rome by Innocent III in 1206, and from that time until his death he remains in the forefront of the historical picture.

The death of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, had left the See vacant, and since the character of King John was well known to the Pope, he was most anxious that it should be filled by a man who was capable of holding his own in the difficulties that were bound to beset him. Such a man he believed

* *Life of Julius Agricola*, c. 13.

that he had found in Langton: he was an Englishman, and therefore would understand the national position in a way impossible to a foreigner; he had had an excellent education, and was as wise in judgment as he was devout in spirit. So great were the difficulties, and so clearly did Langton foresee them, that he was most reluctant to accept. Innocent, however, was not to be turned from his purpose, and on June 17, 1207, the man whom he designated as 'our beloved son, Master de Langton, a man verily endowed with conduct, fame, knowledge and doctrine,' was duly consecrated.

By this obedience to the Pope, Langton was immediately thrust into conflict with the King. The death of Hubert Walter had taken place in 1205, and the monks of Canterbury had chosen their Sub-Prior as his successor, while John demanded the election of the Bishop of Norwich, John de Gray. That the Pope should persist in appointing his own nominee was an affront that John vowed never to forget or forgive.

Desirous of smoothing Langton's path as far as was possible, the Pope addressed a conciliatory letter to John, pointing out the suitability of Langton for the post and requesting the King to receive him with kindness. With this letter he sent a present of four valuable rings: their roundness, he said, was a symbol of eternity; their number—a square—signified firmness of mind founded on the four great virtues, justice, fortitude, prudence and temperance. The stones with which the rings were set had also their meaning: the emerald symbolized Faith, the sapphire Hope, the garnet Charity, the topaz Good Works.[1] But all these persuasions were thrown away upon John; he flatly refused to receive Langton, punished the monks of Canterbury for their submission to the Pope's decree, and so incensed Innocent by his conduct that the Bishops of London, Ely and Worcester were ordered by him to lay the country under an Interdict.

That Langton remained in France for the next five years is no proof of cowardice. When the Archdeacon of Norwich incurred the King's displeasure, he was thrown into a dungeon, crowned with a leaden cap so heavy that he could not move under its weight, and there left to die.[2] A similar fate would

[1] Thomas Rymer: *Foedera.*

[2] Roger de Wendover: *Flores Historiarum.*

have been the Archbishop's had he dared to land on English soil, and he had no choice but to wait for some favourable turn of events, writing an occasional letter to the clergy, counselling them to patience under the miseries of the Interdict, and from time to time warning the King of the danger of his violence and obstinacy.

The Interdict extended over the whole kingdom; no church bells might be rung, the only Sacraments permitted were the Absolution of the Dying and the Baptism of Infants; marriages and churchings might not take place within consecrated buildings, but were conducted outside the doors. The punishment was a cruel one, and the King, the only guilty person, was the one who suffered least, since he cared nothing for Church privileges, and seized the opportunity of replenishing his coffers by laying hands upon ecclesiastical lands and revenues till all that was left to the clergy was a small allowance 'for reasonable eatage.'[3]

But defiant as John might show himself, there was one arrow in the Papal quiver that he dreaded. The ban of excommunication meant far more than the loss of Church privileges; it meant being stigmatized as a social leper, one whose touch so defiled cup or plate or any other utensil that to use it after him entailed utter degradation. The misery of his subjects was matter for a jest to the King, but his own abasement was a very different thing, and though he was too proud to sue for pardon, it cut him to the quick. One attempt he made to induce Langton to come to England, not as at first, that he might get him into his power, but that he might take up the duties of his office. The letter, however, was addressed to *Stephen Langton, Cardinal of the Roman See*, not to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Langton made no answer to it.

It was in 1209 that the ban was laid upon John,[4] and when three years had passed, the wretchedness of the people under their enforced heathen conditions had become so unbearable that the Bishops of London and Ely went to France to confer with Langton, with the result that all three proceeded to Rome to lay the situation before the Pope. Feeling that there was a

[3] Matthew Paris: *Chronica Majora.*
[4] Roger de Wendover: *Flores Historiarum.*

chance that John's punishment might have weakened his obstinacy, Innocent sent word to him that the ban should be removed if he would acknowledge Langton as Archbishop. His hope was fulfilled, for John despatched a letter to Langton, this time addressed to the 'Archbishop of Canterbury,' and early in July, 1212, the long delayed landing took place.

Langton's first act as Primate was to pronounce absolution on the 20th of July, when the King made solemn confession of his sins in Winchester Cathedral. But Langton's troubles were not over, and it must have seemed a hard thing to him that he had no sooner taken up his post than he had to oppose the very man who had placed him in it. Nicholas of Tusculum, the Legate who was sent to raise the Interdict, chose to ignore the Bishops and proceeded to fill up abbacies and benefices without any reference to them. To pass this over would, Langton felt, be to create a dangerous precedent, and he took immediate steps, so representing the matter to the Pope that he procured the recall of the Legate. This was his first encounter with the Papal power, but it was not to be his last, for when in 1215 the trial of strength took place between John and the Barons, Innocent took part with the King who had so long defied him.

To speak of Langton as the 'author' of *Magna Carta*, as some historians have done, is scarcely correct. Stirred to action by the tyrannies and extortions of John, Langton made search among the ancient records, with the result that he laid before the Barons the laws and enactments made a century earlier by Henry I, and having read them to the assembly, showed them that these laws, with some additions and revisions, would meet all the needs of the case, and received their solemn promise to fight for them 'to the death.'

'Do they think that I will grant them liberties that would make me a slave?' was John's reply when the Charter was submitted to him, and when the Barons persisted, he suggested as a last hope that the matter should be referred to the Pope. But here again, while upholding Law, Langton held firm to Freedom: 'This is a national affair,' he said; 'it must be decided by the nation'—a strong attitude to take up at a time when the Pope was looked upon as the supreme arbiter in all causes, and one which he knew would please John as little as Innocent.

Then followed the historic scene of Runnymede, when on the 15th of June, deserted by all but seven of his nobles, the King descended the slope from Windsor Castle to give his reluctant assent to the demands of the Barons. Each article of the Charter has proved its own special value, but the spirit of the whole is summed up in the brief formula of article 40: 'To none will we sell, to none will we deny, to none will we delay, right or justice.' The freedom of the Church of England was expressly declared in the closing article (73): 'Our will is and we firmly command that the Church of England shall be free, and that the men in our kingdom have and hold the aforesaid liberties, rights and concessions, well and in peace, freely and quietly, fully and entirely, to them and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and all places as is aforesaid. It is also sworn, both on our part and on that of the Barons, that all the aforesaid shall be observed in good faith and without any evil intention. Given by our hand in the meadow which is called Runnymede, between Windsor and Staines, the 15th day of June, in this 17th year of our reign.'

The great battle of English liberty had been won, but, having brought the King into subjection, Langton once more found himself in opposition to the Pope. Nothing was further from John's intentions than the keeping of his promise, and with the ink of his signature scarcely dry, he sent messengers to Innocent telling him that Langton had defied the Papal power, since the King was the vassal of the Holy See. On August 24th the Pope issued a Bull, declaring the Charter to be 'unjust and derogatory to the Apostolic See of Rome,' and ordering it to be 'annulled and abrogated.' Since the Barons refused to obey the demand, Innocent commanded Langton to excommunicate them, and on his declining, summoned him to Rome. Langton obeyed the summons, but maintained his firm attitude unaltered, and it was not until 1216 that the whole situation was changed by the death of Innocent in July, followed in October by the death of John.

Their removal seemed, at the first moment, to cut the knot of the problem; but the new Pope, Honorius III, was determined to retain the Papal hold over England, and Langton could make no way with him. Pandulf, the Legate, was continually engaged in trying to undermine the power of the Regent,

and England seemed fast becoming a mere appanage of Rome. Then it was that Langton's last battle was fought. With unshaken persistence he held to his point that the Church of England must have freedom to act independently, and he so far gained the day that Honorius decreed that the boy-king, Henry III, should be re-crowned by the Archbishop in Westminster Abbey, in spite of the fact that he had already been crowned in Gloucester Cathedral, thus establishing Langton's position. Even this did not content him, however, and once more journeying to Rome, he prevailed upon the Pope to grant his request that no other Legate should be sent to England during his lifetime. Further than this he could not go, but he no doubt hoped that his successor would be able to secure a similar concession, and in the meantime he obtained a decree from Honorius that Henry was now of an age to govern for himself. Having thus won a victory for the freedom of the Church, he proceeded to make the freedom of the State secure, by procuring a confirmation of *Magna Carta* from the young King. It was on this occasion that he broke out into a memorable rebuke during a sitting of Parliament. William Brewer, one of the King's Councillors, protested, saying that the King's assent would be invalid since it would have been extracted by force. 'William!' thundered the Archbishop, 'if you loved the King, you would not throw a stumbling-block in the way of the peace of the realm.' The words went home to the consciences of his hearers, and the Charter was signed.

It was in adjusting the relations between Church and State that Langton's greatest work was done, but his powers of administration were also used within the boundaries of the Church itself; the coming of the Friars resulted in increased care of the sick and instruction of the ignorant, and this work was carried out under his special guidance. He also gave much heed to the restoration of churches, and caused a number of new vicarages to be built that the clergy might be resident in their parishes.

That among his multifarious duties Langton found time for study and for writing, we know from the chroniclers. A *Life of Richard I* is attributed to him, and other works, among them Expositions of some of the Books of the Bible. Ralph Higden, in his *Polychronicon* (Bk. VII, ch. xxxiv), says: 'He coted (*i.e.*,

numbered, from the French *coter*) the Bible at Paris, and marked the chapitres.' This statement has been disputed, as some writers say that the division of the Bible into chapters and the numbering of the verses was not his work, but that of Hugh de Cler, a French scholar. Their opinion may possibly be correct, but in his own day Higden was looked upon as an unassailable authority, and in the century after his death (1363) it is stated that the whole of the *Polychronicon* was copied by over a hundred scribes, while Caxton selected it for one of the early productions of his Press.

The Bodleian Library preserves one undoubted production of the great Archbishop's in the shape of a MS. Latin poem (Bodl. MSS. 57, f. 66), but a relic of even greater interest is to be found in the British Museum Library (Arundel MSS. 292, f. 38). This is a short sermon, based on a verse of a French ballad which was popular in Paris at the time of his residence there. The verse is taken as a text, and he gives it a theological interpretation—ingenious, but very fanciful. It runs as follows, in its quaint old French :

'Bele Aliz matin leva,
Son cors vesti e para,
En un verger s'en entra,
Cink fleurettes y truva.
Un chapelet fet en a
Rose fleurie ;
Pur Deu trahez vus en la
Vus ki ne amez mie.'

This verse, he says, may be taken as a parable of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who, like 'beautiful Alice,' adorns herself each returning morn in the eyes of the faithful ; *Verger*, an orchard, is the same word as *Virgo*, a Virgin, she who was overshadowed by the power of the Holy Ghost to bring forth fruit to God ; the five flowers typify Faith, Hope, Charity, Virginity, and Humility ; the chaplet signifies the crown of gold which God places upon the head of her who was Blessed among Women ; the last two lines speak of the enemies of God, those who are traitors to Him, since they love not the Blessed Virgin. He concludes with the words : 'By all this we see the Bele Aliz is really the Mater Misericordiae, who dwells in Heaven with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.'

If all Langton's sermons were like this, it can hardly be said that preaching was his strong point; but it is not fair to judge from one specimen, and in any case the measure of his other achievements is so great that he needs no additional lustre. Confronted from the time of his consecration to his death in 1928 with problems as formidable as any that the history of our land has shown, he met them with wisdom, courage and devotion, proving, as Dean Hook has said, that he was 'qualified to shine equally in the Court and the Cloister, among politicians as among scholars, and in the conduct of public affairs no less than in the meditations of the contemplative life.'

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION AND OURS

By the Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D., Rector of Haughton, Staffordshire.

'IF Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain.' St. Paul was right. I will not labour to prove it, I assume it as my starting-point. For the history of the Church implies a past adequate to account for it. It was not built upon a dead Christ, but upon One who is alive for evermore. It is not the fact, but the mode of His survival and ours that I wish to discuss. Are the two clauses in the Apostles' Creed, 'Rose again the third day from the dead,' and 'I believe in the Resurrection of the Body,' strictly parallel? There is no doubt that they were so originally. 'Resurrection of the Body' was interchangeable with 'Resurrection of the Flesh,' as it still is in the old Prayer Book. The new book has dropped 'flesh' out of the baptismal creed. *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις, carnis resurrectio*, is still orthodox doctrine. No other form appears before the fourth century in either West or East. The Creed of Aquileia, which belongs to the fourth century, has *huius carnis resurrectio*, which Rufinus interprets as teaching 'the absolute identity of the future with the present body' (Burn, *Introd. to Creeds*, p. 205). In the Middle Ages bishops were asked at their consecration, 'Dost thou believe in the resurrection of this flesh which thou now hast on thee?' Plain words which we all explain away now were taken literally then. 'With their bodies' (Athanasian Creed) meant what it said. There is a mural tablet

in Bredon Church, near Pershore, bearing the following inscription: 'Thomas Copley Esquire whom God took to His mercye: Maii 20, 1593. I knowe that my Redeemer liveth, & that I shall rise out of the earth in the last day, this hope is laid up in my bosome. Iob, cap. 19.' And I find this addition in a Prayer Book dated 1642: 'And that I shall be covered again with my skin, & shall see God in my flesh: yea, & I myself shall behold him, not with other, but with these same eyes.' Taken together, these words give a fairly accurate rendering of the Vulgate.

Clement of Rome is another misquoter of Job, giving *καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην* where the LXX has *τὸ δέρμα* or *τὸ σῶμα* (*Ep.* i, 26). Those deeper thinkers, like Origen, who dared to question the resurrection of the flesh were regarded with suspicion. According to Origen the soul will make for itself a new resurrection body. 'This,' as Dean Inge remarks (*Plotinus* i, p. 102), 'resembles the Pauline view of the resurrection, which differs widely, as every candid and attentive reader must acknowledge, from the later Catholic orthodoxy.' To-day we have gone back to St. Paul's theory of the spiritual body. 'I admit this point (you Greeks are right), that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God' (I *Cor.* xv, 50). St. Paul seems to regard the spiritual body as developed from the physical body, like a plant from a seed, or as put on over it like a garment. Those who are alive at Christ's coming will undergo a metamorphosis like an insect. 'The dead shall be raised incorruptible (arise with new bodies from their graves), and we (the living) shall be transformed.' We are apt to apply his words to the dead, when really St. Paul is thinking of those who will be alive at the Parousia, as in II *Cor.* v, and *Phil.* iii, 20, 21: 'Who shall change the body of our low estate.' The modern view is that the physical body perishes entirely and is never raised. The word 'resurrection' has been given a new meaning, and the phrase 'general resurrection in the last day' has been emptied of all meaning. There is no physical connexion between the old body and the new. At death the soul will be clothed in a form suitable to its new environment. 'I believe in the resurrection of the body' is interpreted as meaning 'I believe that the individual will survive with the fullness of his personality and powers of self-expression, recognizable as the same self': or

'I believe in the identity and continuity of the Ego in the new life,' in the words of Article IV, 'with all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature.'

It is impossible to prove that our bodies will not be resuscitated from the earth in a semi-material attenuated or 'glorified' form, cold and bloodless yet with some measure of substance and solidity. But Science gives no support to such a belief, and it is generally accepted that the physical and the spiritual are entirely distinct, and that the buried corpse is buried for ever. Yet ten years ago in a Cheshire school I heard an inspector tell the children: 'God will wake up all the dead people at the last day.' And only this year I heard an archdeacon commend the old-fashioned epitaph, 'Near this lies the body of John Jones, in hope of the resurrection to eternal life.' I do not doubt that archdeacons can be saved, but such epitaphs as 'Waiting for the Resurrection,' or 'Waiting for the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,' are seldom used now, and with good reason. They are a picturesque survival and no more. If the well-known hymns, 'The saints of God' and 'On the Resurrection morning,' had been written to-day instead of in the nineteenth century their authors would probably have worded certain lines differently.

In the Bible we see two lines of thought struggling for the mastery. According to the one the departed soul lives a truncated half-life in the under-world, until at some future time unknown the flesh and bones are raised from the dust and reunited with it.[1] The most famous passages in the Old Testament are Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones (xxxvii, 1-14); *Isaiah* xxvi, 19, which probably belongs to an apocalyptic book of about 300 B.C.; and *Daniel* xii, 2, c. 165 B.C. According to the other line of thought the soul immediately enters on a richer and fuller life. Many of the apocryphal books of the first century B.C. taught a resurrection of the spirit only (*cf.* Charles, *Between the Testaments*, pp. 54-63). The best-known passage is *Wisdom* iii, 1-3, 'The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God.' But the fourth book of Esdras, which is later than St. Paul and generally

[1] In Hebrew psychology the flesh and bones are part of the personality. See Dr. Wheeler Robinson's essay in *The People and the Book*, and Dr. Oesterley's *Immortality and the Unseen World*, ch. ii.

placed in the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.), has 'Et terra reddet quae in ea dormiunt, et pulvis qui in eo silentio habitant, et promptuaria reddent quae eis commendatae sunt animae.' This is as materialistic as anything in the Old Testament. Both lines of thought, the materialistic and the spiritualistic, are represented in the New Testament, but it is clear that St. Paul inclines to the latter, and that in the minds of many Christians to-day it is the only tolerable conception of the future life. The Prayer Book with pardonable inconsistency preserves both views side by side in the Burial Service. 'The souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh are in joy and felicity.' They already 'live with God.' But their bodies are buried 'in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection,' or waiting for 'the general Resurrection in the last day.' Meanwhile their souls will have to wait in a disembodied or naked condition, possibly asleep, for it may be millions of years. This ill-accords with the belief that 'to depart is to be with Christ,' and that 'we shall be like Him'; or with His words to the Penitent Thief, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'

How then was He raised, and with what body did He come back from death? I was aware more than twenty years ago that doubts had been cast on the traditional story of the Empty Tomb, but I made light of them. The *Hibbert Journal* contained articles on the subject in 1904, 1905, and 1906, the first being by the Rev. Canon Hensley Henson, B.D.[2] In 1911 the Rev. J. M. Thompson published his book on Miracles, which drew a storm of denunciation from the majority of English ecclesiastics. Dr. Rashdall was among the exceptions. Then in the following year Professor Kirsopp Lake published *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. It created no great stir. His theory that the women had gone to the wrong tomb seemed to me too fantastic to be worth taking seriously, and I passed it by. But the volume of criticism was swelling rapidly. In the same year came *Foundations*, with Dr. Streeter's essay, and the Bishop of Zanzibar's protest, and also Dr. Hensley Henson's *The Creed in the Pulpit*, which was used in an attempt to prevent his consecration as Bishop of Hereford. In 1914 controversy waxed hot again, and numerous letters and pamphlets

[2] Following Schmiedel's article in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

were written. Dr. Sanday at Oxford, and Dr. Bethune-Baker at Cambridge, came forward as the champions of those who claim to interpret the Resurrection clauses in the Creed symbolically. In 1920 Dr. Glazebrook maintained the same claim against the Bishop of Ely in his book, *The Letter and the Spirit*. Meanwhile Dr. Bethune-Baker had published *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*—a fuller statement of his views—in 1918. Nothing has happened since then to weaken the position of these scholars. Those who are accustomed to read between the lines can discern a steady trend of opinion in their favour. Dean Inge continues to utter contemptuous *obiter dicta* about a three-storied universe. Dr. Rawlinson, in his recent Bampton Lectures on The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, takes up an agnostic position about the problem before us. Dr. W. R. Matthews, in an Easter sermon of this year, reported in *The Guardian*, conspicuously avoids it and by implication leaves it open. Dr. McNeile is chided by a reviewer of his *Introduction to the New Testament* for minimizing the importance of the Empty Tomb. Finally we have Mr. Gardner-Smith's book, *The Narratives of the Resurrection*, first published in 1926. It is obviously the work of a careful and thorough scholar, whose one aim is to get at the truth, and discover the facts that lie behind conflicting traditions. It is this book which has at last impelled me to make a fresh study of the Gospel narratives, comparing and sifting them verse by verse, and then trying to stand away from them and get a general impression of the wood as well as the trees.

First of all, what happened at the Ascension? If the traditional view is right, our Lord was raised from the earth with a ponderable body of flesh and bones, though possibly bloodless, and disappeared behind a cloud. The earth, according to Father Knox, was so many pounds lighter at the Ascension. If we could now question a Christian of the first century and say, 'Suppose an eagle had been soaring several thousand feet above the cloud, would he have seen the body of Christ passing beyond him into space?' we should certainly receive an answer in the affirmative. Even Canon Cook in the *Speaker's Commentary* could write, 'The cloud was not to envelop but to sustain Him . . . If He had vanished abruptly it would not have been equally

clear that His glorified Manhood had been taken up.'[3] In the mediaeval universities the question was seriously debated whether Christ's body was taken up clothed or naked. This picture of the Ascension as a journey through space is obviously pre-Copernican and untenable. We now know that if our Lord had travelled as fast as light itself He would still be far from the limits of the visible universe. Accordingly *liaison* interpreters like Westcott and Swete take the picture out of its old-fashioned frame and touch it up. They treat the Ascension as an historical occurrence up to a few hundred feet from the crust of the earth, and after that as symbolism or parable. This is Swete's paraphrase of the story in *Acts* i. 'The Lord was now lifted up, and as His feet were seen to rise from the ground, a low cloud, coming up from the Mediterranean, swept the side of the hill, wrapt Him round, and then sailed away eastward and upward, as if it were carrying Him to heaven.' Yet in the same book, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, he refers to the ἀναβαίνω of *John* xx, 17, as the 'incipient Ascension,' and adds in a footnote, 'The withdrawal from the visible world and exaltation to heaven began in fact from the moment of the Resurrection' (pp. 9 and 104).

The description in *Acts* i is not supported by anything in the rest of the New Testament. When Luke wrote his Gospel he evidently had not heard of it (*cf.* xxiv, 44, 50, 51), nor had 'John,' which is still more remarkable. It suggests something stage-managed for evidential purposes, to deceive the disciples into thinking that in order to leave the world their Lord had to make a journey through space to some point above their heads; which was certainly not the case. It is safer to regard the Ascension simply as the last of the Resurrection appearances, coloured by later tradition and doubtless supported by the legends of Elijah and Enoch.[4] If Christ was in heaven, it would follow that He must have journeyed thither somehow. What then became of His flesh and bones and clothing? That they passed

[3] There are pearls of great price in Dummelow's Commentary. 'Probably our Lord was in heaven during the Forty Days, descending to earth for occasional interviews' (note on *Luke* xxiv, 26).

[4] Dr. Loofs quotes the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 130 A.D.): 'We celebrate the eighth day (the Sunday) in great joy, for on that day Jesus rose from the dead and ascended into heaven after revealing Himself.' He adds the comment: 'The ascension just forty days after Easter is but a legend' (*What is the truth about Jesus Christ?* p. 124).

outside the earth's atmosphere is as incredible now as it was credible then. Did the material particles of them remain in the cloud and finally descend to earth with the rain? Or was the earthly body discarded on the Cross and never resumed? Or did it undergo some mysterious transubstantiation of which we know nothing; gradually losing weight, heat, blood and colour? In the Emmaus story Christ is at first an ordinary human being, but unrecognized by the two disciples because 'their eyes were holden.' Immediately afterwards the Eleven 'were terrified and affrighted and thought they saw a spirit.'

Taking St. Paul's evidence first, we notice that he regards the appearances to himself as strictly parallel with those to the other Apostles, and Christ's resurrection as strictly parallel with our own. In I *Cor.* xv he argues from one to the other, backwards and forwards, with no hint that they are different in nature. Did he believe in the Empty Tomb? There is a difference of opinion here among critics. 'Was buried' and 'on the third day' suggest that he did, so do the Greek words for 'raise' and 'resurrection.' But there is some evidence that ἐγείρειν and ἀνίστασθαι were capable of meaning a purely spiritual resurrection, *cf. Mark* xii, 26 (Glazebrook, *Letter and Spirit*, pp. 113-115). And it remains true that St. Paul's argument is independent of the Empty Tomb; he never appeals to it as evidence. He ignores the appearance to women, possibly from anti-feminine prejudice: he was convinced by what he himself had seen.

We now come to the Gospels. The first essential is to recognise that there is a problem and a very difficult one. To begin with, Matthew and Mark place all the appearances in Galilee, while Luke and John (except *John* xxi) place them all in Judaea. The other discrepancies are too numerous and striking to be airily disposed of as marks of originality and independence. They prove beyond a doubt that we are not reading scientific history, but a mass of conflicting traditions written down long after the event. Anyone who will take the trouble to make a first-hand comparison of the four Gospels verse by verse, with the help of Lake or Gardner-Smith will agree thus far. But the reconstruction of *Mark* xvi, 6 by these two scholars is drastic and uncertain. *Codex Bezae* reads ἴδετε ἐκεῖ [τὸν] τόπον αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. They propose to cut out ἠγέρθη, 'he is risen,' which is not in Luke or John, and translate: 'He is not here: lo! There is the

place,' *i.e.*, 'you have come to the wrong tomb, it is over there.' Omit ἠγέρθη, and the fear and silence of the women is explained. As the text stands, verses 7 and 8 are inconsistent. Mr. Gardner-Smith thinks it almost certain that ἠγέρθη was interpolated into the original story, and defends his view with great skill. It was twilight ('still dark' according to John, 'sunrise' in Mark),[5] there were many tombs close together, the district was unfamiliar to Galileans, the women's nerves were over-wrought, their errand was secret and they feared discovery; so when they met a strange young man at the tomb they hurried away and said nothing. If anything was said to them at the tomb they would not be likely to remember it accurately.

But we are told that they 'beheld where he was laid,' and would not the mistake have been discovered before long? I prefer the view that they made no mistake, and that the tomb was empty. But how was it emptied? Here, if anywhere, is the rock on which all critical theories split. No really satisfactory answer has yet replaced the traditional theory of resuscitation. Yet the improbability of it is so great that scholars are fully justified in seeking a reverent and reasonable alternative. One night as I lay awake puzzling over the problem, there flashed into my mind the notion of reading ἦρθη for ἠγέρθη. To cut out only two letters is less violent than cutting out a whole word, and αἴρω happens to be the very verb used in John xx, 13, 'they have taken away my Lord.' If the body (τὸ πτῶμα, Mark xv, 45) had been burnt in the valley of Hinnom it would have made no more difference to our Lord than cremation will make to us. Could it after all have been secretly removed by disciples and reburied? According to *Matt.* xxviii, 13, this explanation of the Empty Tomb was still current when that Gospel was written. Justin Martyr alludes to the use made of it by anti-Christian Jews (*Dial.* cviii). I admit that the Matthaean version, when I compare it with Mark, reads to me like an apocryphal gospel, and of little historical value. For instance, we may safely dismiss the sealing of the tomb and the setting of a watch as a later accretion. But, taking *Matt.* xxviii, 13, as a possible key to the mystery, I would reconstruct the story thus, after the manner of a modern novelist. His disciples forsook Him and fled. His four brothers, led by

[5] Dr. Major thinks it quite certain that an οὐκ has dropped out before ἀνατείλαντος in Mk. xvi, 2 (*Jesus by an Eyewitness*, p. 98).

James, to whom Paul says He appeared in person, were filled with shame and remorse. They had despised Him while He lived, they would do Him honour in His death. A stranger, a member of the Sanhedrin, had actually been allowed to bury him. And so in the dead of night they rescued the embalmed body and conveyed it to their family burial-place at Nazareth, three days' journey from Jerusalem. No wonder 'some doubted' even when they saw Him! Why had He not resumed the old life and shown Himself to the people? The Jews discovered the empty tomb and the explanation was circulated, as Matthew records. Had they not seen the Lord, and was not that enough? The Lord was risen indeed and the tomb was undeniably empty. To most Jews *the one fact implied the other*, and both had been verified independently. And when the four were convinced by the appearance to James, perhaps to all of them, that their Elder Brother was still alive, they did not go and open any tomb to see if the body was still there, they accepted the message of Mary: 'Go and tell my brothers, I am ascending to my Father and your Father.' And so they reached a faith which was independent of tombs closed or open. The last Adam had become a life-giving Spirit. Then the wonderful story grew and gathered fresh material from every possible source. It was a credulous and uncritical age, as we know from its apocryphal literature. The Scriptures were searched for parallels and predictions. Mark's young man at the tomb (was he the young man of xiv, 51, in a linen cloth, possibly Mark himself?) became an angel in shining garments, then two angels; in the Gospel of Peter two angels of colossal stature. In Matthew we see a marked heightening of the marvellous, especially in xxviii, 1-4. In John we find a conflation of variant traditions, with a strong evidential purpose. The Lord had appeared at a meal, possibly a Eucharist. It was natural to believe that He must have partaken of that meal. He had given Thomas firsthand evidence of the reality of His risen life. It was natural to believe that He had offered His unhealed wounds to human fingers. But there the story breaks off in a reverent reticence and the Church's supreme confession of faith. And there let us leave it.

There were two traditions concerning the Lord's risen body. One was that it was material, resuscitated from the tomb, able to consume food, and levitated from the earth to some other

place. The other, that it was immaterial, spiritual or ghostlike, able to pass through closed doors, appearing and disappearing at will, able even to pass through grave-clothes without disturbing them, though strangely enough the stone had to be rolled away from the mouth of the tomb. Did the body pass out *before* the stone was rolled away? And was it rolled away, as Bishop Horsley suggested more than a century ago, not to let the Lord out, but to let the women in? There was no firsthand witness of the Resurrection itself. The two traditions were really inconsistent, and this explains the failure to fuse them completely. The materialistic tradition was an inevitable sequel to the belief that physical death was due to sin, and that if Adam and Eve had not fallen, they would have been translated like Enoch. St. Paul apparently shared this belief (cf. *Rom.* v, 12; I *Cor.* xv, 22); but if his picture of the Last Day in I *Thess.* iv is crudely materialistic, his doctrine of the spiritual body in I and II *Cor.* is at least compatible with the modern view that the spiritual body is assumed immediately at death. And if this will be true of us, but was not true of our Lord, then the parallel between His resurrection and ours is seriously impaired, and I *Cor.* xv, 12-23, must be re-written.

In conclusion, it is true that the original meaning of the Creeds is clear. But it is equally true that the original meaning of several clauses has already been changed by the most orthodox believers, notably those stating the Descent into Hell, the Ascension, and the Resurrection of the Flesh. It is perhaps worth while recalling that the theory of the Atonement as a ransom paid to Satan held the field against all others for a thousand years, and that the old doctrines of Creation and the Fall, everlasting punishment, and the inerrancy of Scripture, which we now repudiate, were almost universally held within the lifetime of some of us, and only surrendered after a long and bitter struggle. God did not see fit to preserve the Church from error in these matters; and if the history of the past is any guide, it must be that 'God has more truth to break forth from His Word,' and that the Spirit of Truth has yet many things to show us, as we are able to bear them. Surely it is only reasonable to believe that the material particles of our Lord's earthly body were rendered back unto the earth that gave them. How this was accomplished is one of the secret things which belong unto the Lord

our God, and is comparatively unimportant. But it seems more probable that the earthly body was abandoned at death, as we expect our own to be, than that it was resuscitated from the tomb, dematerialized and transubstantiated before, during, or after a period of forty days. In any case, we can say with St. Paul: 'The second man is of heaven' . . . 'Death is swallowed up in victory.' Is not that enough?

NOTE.

In addition to the works referred to in the text, the following may be found useful.

(1) *The Ascension.* A Sermon preached by Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D., before the University of Cambridge on Ascension Day, 1917, and published in *The Modern Churchman,* May, 1918.

(2) *The Future State.* A Sermon preached by the Rev. C. W. Emmet before the University of Oxford on November 7th, 1920, and published in *The Modern Churchman,* March, 1921.

(3) *The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body.* Documents relating to the Question of Heresy raised against the Rev. H. D. A. Major, Ripon Hall, Oxford. Issued by the Right Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford, 1922.

There is a bibliography at the end of Kirsopp Lake's *Resurrection of Jesus Christ.*

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PILGRIM'S WAY.*

We all knew Dr. Fosdick through his illuminating devotional studies. But now he has appeared in the new rôle of Cicerone. And we venture to predict from the quality of the book before us that he will be as popular in this capacity as he certainly has been helpful in others. But his latest work is not merely a guide, though it is very capable in that sphere: it is also a veritable mine of information concerning the geography and history of Palestine and the many currents of national and ecclesiastical life which are to be seen there by the careful observer. There are many things which —as Dr. Fosdick himself says somewhere—to be fully understood need not only sight but insight. And after reading this book with more enjoyment than we have experienced in a similar class of work for some time, we can only say that Dr. Fosdick touches nothing which he does not illuminate and make forcibly interesting. A detailed knowledge of the Bible, its history and interpretation, and a wide knowledge of the geography of the lands which give a setting to its story—all this we are prepared to accredit him with. But this is only a part of the value of his latest book. He has so used his information that it must inevitably stimulate the interest of the reader in the pages of the Bible itself. The book is a guide to Palestine and a commentary on the Scriptures at the same time. And since Dr. Fosdick has the gift of making us *see* the scenes which he describes, we lose sense of type and script and find ourselves back in the times of the Old Testament, now trudging with Moses and his people through the weary desert plains, now standing beside the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite and watching spellbound as with kaleidoscopic motion it changes hands from king to priest, from Jew to Christian and from Christian to Moslem, until that site of the Temple has a new meaning

**A Pilgrimage to Palestine,* by H. E. Fosdick, D.D. (S.C.M. 1928. Pp. 332. 8/6.)

for us as 'a holy shrine to the Moslem, a wistful memory to the Christian and a desperate hope to the Jew' (p. 121).

Dr. Fosdick groups his story around the history of the nation. Hence the pilgrimage is not only from place to place but from era to era as, after journeying with the Hebrews to Sinai, we follow now the adventures of David, now the wanderings of the prophets, now the toil of the Master, until we find ourselves with the Zionists settling under British guarantee. And the penetrating insight which Dr. Fosdick brings to his experiences enables us the more easily to jump the centuries. Now he is being entertained by an Arab host, and as they thrust hands into the common dish we picture ourselves back among the Patriarchs (p. 75). Now he is the guest of the Samaritan High Priest while the rites of the Passover are being celebrated on Mount Gerizim (p. 127). Now he is finding in Arab conversation some striking illustrations of the way in which they see and interpret ordinary events in terms of miracle (p. 138). Now he is talking with Moslems or Jews and drawing from them their respective views of the significance of the Zionist movement so that his unprejudiced account of these activities, with the deep warnings and hopes which he utters about them, comes with an air of some authority. He has many trenchant criticisms to make of the militarism, monasticism and mummery which, he says, are historic Christianity's three chief exhibitions in the Master's land. And lest *we* should feel any sense of superiority, let the following passage speak its shameful message: 'Even in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher (American spelling is retained throughout the book) no Westerner may be contemptuous because *Moslem* soldiers are needed to guard the sanctuary. They are needed, to be sure, on special occasions to keep the rival Christians here from flying at one another's throats, especially when high festivals like Easter bring excited throngs of pilgrims from many lands. But they are needed also day in and day out through all the year, not to keep Eastern Christians from fighting, but to keep Western Christians from stealing. Nothing is safe from their rapacity in this sacred place; they have even brought hammers to chip souvenirs from the Holy Sepulcher' (p. 268).

Readers will find this book teeming with learning, interest—and humour.

J.P.H.

LOCALISATION IN CULTUS.*

A good deal of work is being done in the study of the Christian sacraments, and is likely to have results no less 'disturbing' than other critical enquiries. In this sphere the appearance of Dr. Bouquet's volume is most opportune. What is perhaps most needed at the present time is the study of the nature and value of the ideas and practices round which controversy has recently centred, considered as kinds of religion. Towards the satisfaction of this need, Dr. Bouquet's volume makes a valuable contribution. The subject is approached from the right point of view. In the first place, it is considered critically, and not in the spirit of advocacy. And, in the second place, the Christian sacraments and the customs connected with them are examined frankly in the light of the practices and ideas of other religions, *i.e.* as instances of religious tendencies generally and of a type of devotion not confined to the Christian Church. This is right because what is most needed is a more thorough examination of the *value* of these practices, of whether they are in the higher or the lower line of religious development; and the wider field of comparative religion provides the truer perspective and the calmer atmosphere which such an examination demands.

**The Real Presence or the Localisation in Cultus of the Divine Presence.* By A. C. Bouquet, D.D. (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1928. Price 4/-.)

The subject of the enquiry is 'localisation in worship.' Dr. Bouquet adopts the term 'localisation' purposely, because it is colourless: the 'real presence' has too exclusive an association with the Eucharist, and 'idolatry' a derogatory sense which tends to prejudice enquiry. By 'localisation' he means the 'cultus of the deity by means of the direction of attention upon concrete objects.' The book begins with an examination of our inherited attitude to localisation—the 'peril of idolatry' and the injunction 'to turn from these vain things to the living God,' and the consequent duty of iconoclasm. Dr. Bouquet suggests that, in view of the prevalence and toleration of localisation in other religions, this attitude derives solely from the Semitic temperament and from the prophetic tradition; but perhaps such a conclusion is too narrow, in view of considerations to be mentioned later. Then the practice of localisation is examined in the light of anthropological evidence. A good deal of material is collected, illustrating the prevalence of localisation, especially amongst primitive peoples and in modern Hinduism. Long and instructive quotations are given from, *e.g.*, Jevons, Count Keyserling's *Diary*, and the Jesuit Father Acosta. In particular the rites of localisation in food are discussed, and affinities with Christian practice insisted upon: that the affinities (at least with some forms of worship found within Christianity) really exist, the quotation (p. 45 n.) from a Roman manual is enough to show. The conclusion drawn from the study of the anthropological evidence is this:

> I have quoted the foregoing passages, not of course to belittle the Christian sacrament, but in order to point out the fact that the mechanism (so to speak) of the sacramental meal and of the veneration of food is the same outside Christianity as it is inside it. The difference lies in the character of the Deity whose presence is in each case mediated to the worshipper rather than in the mechanism of the mediation (p. 43 f).

And again:

> Except for the character of the Deity 'on the other side' [the reference is to Mgr. Benson's story *In the Convent Chapel*, which is quoted] I cannot for the life of me see how these experiences differ as far as the mechanism of them goes from those of the properly taught Hindu who uses a localised symbol (p. 82 f.).

Such a comparison may be repugnant to some readers. It should act as a warning; but repugnant it should not be, for however fundamental the opposition between Christianity and some other religions may be, they all are *religion*, and, whether high or low, the expressions of an experience and aspiration common to all mankind.

The second half of the book is more definitely an examination, in the light of the evidence collected, of the Christian sacrament and of those practices of adoration and reservation which may fairly be called examples of localisation in worship. Are these uses of the sacrament good or bad, signs of religious activity or of degeneracy, a true development or a return to the jungle of primitive religion? Dr. Bouquet regards them with sympathy, though critically. His purpose is rather to provide material for a solution, and to show the true line of approach in such an enquiry, than to state definite conclusions. In general, it may be said that he regards this use of the sacrament as not illegitimate if rightly guarded, but as dangerous if used without proper restraint; different temperaments require different kinds of worship, and they may have them *provided* that the level of religion is not lowered in order to satisfy a temperament or to get 'quick results.' I may give two further quotations in indication of the standpoint of the author, and then offer certain reflections of my own.

'In the above remarks I have tried to be as fair and as sympathetic as possible in my estimate of the position of those who earnestly desire my own Church to tolerate within its limits some kind of extra-liturgical devotion, and I have tried to show the lines on which as it seems to me it is just possible for that toleration to proceed. Such a step would involve a new kind of comprehensiveness on the part of our Church. I must confess, however, that I am not myself so far convinced that that comprehensiveness should come about. Localised cultus of this sort lies completely outside the purview of the Founder of Christianity and of the line of prophets of which He is obviously the Crown. It involves a syncretism to which the whole atmosphere of Jewish theology was hostile. It certainly achieves quick results; but we may question whether it does not hinder many people from ever making real spiritual progress beyond a certain point, so that they never come to the full realisation of the presence in His full intensity of the invisible Christ beside them at every moment of their daily lives. Of course it may be held that such realisation is impossible save for a few spiritual aristocrats, and that we ought not to grudge less favoured souls their humbler means of access. I reject the latter conclusion, however, because I do not see that we have any right to despair of the possibilities of the simple soul' (p. 84 f.).

'It seems to me that anyone who is inclined to regard the practices of Catholicism and Hinduism with little sympathy must needs take account of this curious human drift or tendency to employ symbols charged with strong emotional significance for purposes of concentration and renewal especially in religion. As soon as these symbols are got rid of in one form they seem to return in another. The simplificatory processes of religious reformers often end in the return of the jungle of natural religion. If the abandonment of image cultus was a real progressive simplification, then it may be that what we now see happening in England is only an example of what happened in India with the gradual extinction of Buddhism. There is a real principle involved in resistance to this return of the jungle, and I wish that my Catholic friends would recognise it a little more. The proper recognition of the relation of religion to art is no valid excuse for the retention or reintroduction of an approach to the Deity which might perhaps have been valid at a lower and more primitive cultural level' (p. 92 f.).

In forming our own conclusions about these very important matters, Dr. Bouquet's volume will be of real service, by reason both of the material it provides for a judgment and of the standpoint from which the examination is made. But there are, I think, two considerations it is important to bear in mind:

(*a*) We are accustomed to think that the practical antithesis confronting us is always one between 'Religion' and 'No-religion.' It is in man's interest, and it is our duty, to foster religion and to decrease irreligion. In certain circumstances this may be true. But in times of religious change it is not so. The practical antithesis, on the contrary, is one between 'Good religion' and 'Bad religion.' Not *some* or *none*, but *high* or *low*, is the real alternative. Religion is too essential to man, too deeply rooted in his nature and the world's, ever to die out, except perhaps in a local or temporary way, under the influence probably of artificial surroundings. It will not die out. But it may well degenerate; and it will do so with a fatal facility. In our present circumstances, it is of the first importance that this should be remembered and acted upon. The great changes

in religious history have not been from atheism or godliness: they have been sometimes from a low religion to a higher, sometimes from a high religion to a lower. It is no argument for a practice that it makes a strong appeal or has immediate results; for the appeal may be strong because made to a low instinct, and the results may be immediate because, like most worthless things, they are easily obtained. We are not, probably, in danger of permanent irreligion; but we are in danger of an increase of degenerate religion.

(*b*) We are often told that the practice of extra-liturgical devotions, and the conceptions of the Sacrament of Holy Communion which these imply, are natural to certain types of character; that these conceptions and those opposed to them correspond to differences of temperament; that they represent two methods of approach, each equally legitimate; and that, therefore, we should be tolerant and recognise all needs. In such contentions there is some truth; and if they contained the whole truth it would be right to tolerate these differences, and wrong to make a principle out of what in that case would be but a personal preference. The opposition to the practices in question, however, is based upon the conviction that more than this is involved. Furthermore, the opposition does not come only, perhaps it never comes fundamentally, from what those on the other side sometimes call Protestant prejudice. That 'prejudice' itself is more than an historical accident; it rests upon a conviction about religion which may exist independently of other, often temporary and mistaken, beliefs associated with it. The difference, according to this conviction, is not one merely of temperament; it is a difference between two kinds of religion. It is not merely a difference in the *method of approach*; it is a difference in the *conception of the Object approached*. That, if true, at once makes it a real difference of principle; it shows that much more is at stake than preference; and it suggests that the basis of the opposition is not to be found in any accidental associations with Hebrew history and ideas, but deeper down in religious ideals and apprehension—influenced, indeed, by historical associations, but essentially dependent upon a true apprehension of the nature of the Divine. The real ground of opposition to the extremer developments of 'localisation' seems to be the sense that they are false to the higher conceptions of God. If this is so, it is clear that fundamentals really are at stake. I have said that the matter of first importance is always that religion should be kept at its highest level, and that it should not be allowed to degenerate. The truest criterion of the level of religion is the conception of God which is really accepted; and especially whether that conception is *ethical* or not. If the practices in question tend to lower the conception of God and to make that conception less ethical, whatever may be their apparent success or immediate attraction, they are quite certainly doing the worst possible disservice to the cause of religion.

These considerations deserve, at all events, to be borne in mind in forming a judgment. If the nature of the Divine is *not* at stake in these conflicts, then the issues are of no great importance; it is not *how* you worship, but only *what* you worship which really matters. But in this case we should, on *both* sides, be ready to regard the practices in question as of secondary moment, being willing to allow them or to abolish them as seems expedient. If, however, the nature of the Divine *is* at stake, the conflicts are concerned with what is of more importance for religion, and so for the practical policy of the Church to-day, than anything else at all. It is with this issue in mind that the question should be considered.

J. S. Boys Smith.

HASTINGS RASHDALL*

Friends of the late Hastings Rashdall owe no small debt of gratitude to Mr. P. E. Matheson, Fellow of New College, Oxford, for his delightful *Life* of that great Oxford Scholar and English Churchman. His book reveals sides of the Dean's character which those who knew him only through his historical, philosophical, and theological writings, may not have suspected. Here we see aspects of his interior life, so deeply religious, so sternly conscientious, so nobly generous, so conspicuously courageous. Incessant labour, many-sided service, thoughtful kindness, genial companionship, childlike simplicity, marked his conduct of life from boyhood to death. The amount of work accomplished, whether as a student, as a tutor, as an author, as a preacher, was truly prodigious, and the quality of his work was as remarkable as its quantity. He had a genius for friendship, not of the popularity-hunting kind, but of the neighbourly kind, which as the intimacy advances neither ignores nor shirks its serious obligations—friendship's duties of service, duties of loyalty, duties of truthfulness, duties even at times of reproof and correction. 'Speak unto thy friend, it may be that he hath not said it, or if he have said it, he will not say it again. Speak unto thy friend, it may be that he hath not done it, or if he have done it, he will not do it again.'

His biographer makes apparent Rashdall's hatred of shallowness, superficiality, sloppiness, self-indulgence, and 'swank.' He hated materialism, arrogance, and selfishness. When he saw signs of them in Church or University, he reprobated them more intensely than in the spheres of trade and politics. No doubt his biographer recalls many stinging remarks which such things prompted, but has not felt that any good purpose could be served by committing them to print. It seems to us the biography would have gained not in charm or moral force, but certainly in colour, if more of this Boswellian element had been introduced into it. If one may give an example, I remember saying to him: 'It looks as though the University were going to elect Lord C—— as Chancellor. He replied tartly: 'Why shouldn't it? Isn't he rich? Isn't he proud? Isn't he a peer? Oxford loves such.'

With younger men he was always quick to correct inaccuracies. 'I thought you didn't believe in athletics,' I remarked. 'Athleticism,' he corrected.

What was so delightful in his conversation was not simply its wide range of knowledge, its humour and wisdom, but its boyish frankness and originality. I remember his complaining of biographies that they never told you what you wanted most to know about their subjects. I said: 'Do give an example.' He replied, 'Well, take the case of Newman, where did he get his money?'

In politics he was a sturdy Liberal, a consistent Democrat. The Principal of Birmingham University has recently pointed out that we owe to him the great phrase 'equality of opportunity.' He was also a devoted patriot although he utterly despised Imperial Jingoism. He desired to do war work, and underwent drills as an Oxford Volunteer in 1915.

Mr. Matheson's biography brings out what a loyal English Churchman Rashdall was. He loved his Church, and understood, as few have done, her constitution and genius. Her freedom, her comprehensiveness, her reasonableness, her sound learning, her sterling morality, the ordered beauty of her services, her ancient cathedrals and parish churches, her close relation to the State, her power of development, her combination of mediaevalism

**The Life of Hastings Rashdall, D.D.* By P. E. Matheson, Fellow of New College. (Oxford University Press, London, Humphrey Milford. 1928. Price 18/-.)

and modernity—all appealed to him. Yet he was very friendly to Non-conformists: he longed for intercommunion with them, and whole-heartedly supported the Bishop of Hereford in his United Communion Service in Hereford Cathedral. His rigorous mediaeval studies enabled him to understand Romanism both theologically and ecclesiastically much better than did many of his fellow-clergy. It was hard that one, who loved the English Church so loyally and was such an ornament to her ministry, should have been so consistently and deliberately ignored by its episcopate on account of his dangerous views. He longed to have a small parish near Oxford that he might combine pastoral with tutorial work, but his Bishop's opposition prevented this. He desired greatly to be an Examining Chaplain, and who could have been a better one? but not until he was over fifty, when Bishop Percival felt it incumbent for the benefit of the Church to promote clergymen of great gifts whom the authorities appeared to be neglecting, did Rashdall receive his first ecclesiastical promotion. What J. H. Newman said of the Church of England in his famous sermon on 'The Parting of Friends,' might, had he ever deigned to be eloquent on his own behalf, have been said by Rashdall.

Mr. Matheson has included a number of characteristic letters in his volume. They show the wide range of the Dean's interests and often, as in a letter to Dr. C. G. Montefiore on the *Jesus of the Synoptists* (p. 161) and to the Rev. Percy Hartill on the *Impassibility of God* (p. 163), possess a real theological value.

Professor C. C. J. Webb's all too brief chapter on Rashdall as Philosopher and Theologian combines lucidity with insight and restraint. The Professor closes his contribution with the delightful and appropriate words which Peter the Venerable used of Abelard:

'De illo saepe et semper cum honore nominando servo et vere Christi philosopho.'

H. D. A. M.

BALLIOL COLLEGE SERMONS.*

The Spaniards have a saying that, as no dish is perfect without garlic, so no sermon is perfect without a citation from St. Augustine. We on our part are disposed to fall in love with the preacher when he cites the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Dr. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, exhibits a tendency of this kind. This indeed is the least of his merits as a modern preacher. He shows us that he sets out with a clear understanding of the difficulties of the present religious situation when he writes in his Preface:—

> 'My experience is that there are many people nowadays to whom Christian doctrines are neither true nor untrue, but simply meaningless.'

As we read him on 'The Promise of Power,' 'Atonement,' 'The Divinity of Christ,' we see what a deep, simple, real thing the Christian religion is, and how little it depends upon the familiar or unfamiliar dogmatic systems into which it has been moulded. Take, for example, Dr. Lindsay's treatment of the Divinity of Christ. He begins by asserting that many would call it 'the central doctrine of the Christian religion,' yet 'it means strangely little' for the ordinary man. Many will say: 'The practical following of Christ, not the consideration of doctrines about Him' is what matters. Quite so; but the preacher retorts: 'If we think like that about the central doctrine of our religion, it can only be because it has become for us a dead doctrine.' He then steadily and strongly advances to the position that

> 'To believe in the divinity of Christ is to believe that what Christ

**The Nature of Religious Truth*, by A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D. (Hodder and Stoughton. 6/-. 1927.)

was in His life and death is the greatest thing in the world—that there is the real secret of the power which is behind the world.'

The weightiest contribution in the volume is a paper of some sixty pages on 'The Nature of Religious Truth.' Here Dr. Lindsay argues that, although religion does not consist in holding propositions to be true, 'yet this is an essential part of religious experience and involves knowledge of some kind, and therefore truth . . . and that this is to be found in the religious experience itself.' He maintains that truth is of various kinds: there is a difference between the truth of a scientific proposition and the truth of a poem. We can only realise the truth in the latter by reproducing in ourselves something of the poet's experience. The test of the truth of religious experience is found in its applicability to life, by its coherence with other experience, and by its rendering reality intelligible. Moreover, although religious experience is not gained by dialectic, yet fidelity to intellectual standards, where they are relevant, enhances the quality of religious experience. Science cannot give us religious truth, yet if we think unscientifically about religion we reduce our ability to share in the highest religious experience.

Dr. Lindsay concludes his paper with a very valuable discussion on creeds and the historical facts which they relate. There are, he maintains, two kinds of truth in history—the scientific truth of its facts and the significance which it found in its facts. This significance depends on a proper understanding of the importance of different elements in reality.

> 'What matters is the universal element which the historical fact displayed and its actualisation in history then and now.'

The creeds are not primarily statements of historic fact, but statements of the significance of historic facts. The creeds are 'signposts to discovered significance.' H.D.A.M.

THE SEAMY SIDE OF LIFE.*

This sequel to Mr. Elliott's *The Sunny Side of Life* was broadcast from London during the Thursday afternoons of Lent last. The subjects dealt with are just those which embitter life for many thoughtful persons both inside and outside the churches of Christendom—*e.g.* 'Trouble,' 'Sin,' 'Misunderstanding,' 'Bereavement' and 'Failure.'

They are not subjects which occupy the foreground in Church Assemblies or the 'religious' Press. This fact, apart from the manner of their treatment—characteristic of the Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone—is worth noting. The B.B.C. has to please a vast multitude of unseen critics, and it makes every effort to attain that important end. In Church circles which count there seems little consciousness of what average listeners-in deem worth listening to in homes large or small.

To-day there are not many voices from Anglican pulpits heard acceptably over the wireless in houses public and private. But there are a few. If Mr. Sheppard is, or was, the Elijah of this tiny band of wireless prophets, Mr. Elliott is becoming the Elisha. The ecclesiastically-minded, both clerical and lay, should note this 'sign of the times.'

Turning to the little collection of addresses before us, we see clearly the kind of religious teaching which 'gets over' to-day.

Its notes are :—

(*a*) Simplicity and lucidity. Every page reveals these desirable qualities of the perfect orator to a marked degree. So digested is the matter that there is a danger lest the reader, who has not heard the preacher's fine delivery full of organ notes, should dismiss the contents as slight and platitudinous.

**Popular Preaching.* By W. H. Elliott. (A. R. Mowbray. 1928. Price 3/6.)

(*b*) The practical and personal appeal which is ever close at hand qualifies this first impression. It is about life and themselves that men and women wish most of all to hear. The B.B.C. knows this well, and Mr. Elliott knows it too. Here again many Churchmen might note 'the handwriting on the wall' of our times, especially those who fondly imagine that the people are for the Church, and not the Church for the people. The jibe made by Mr. Kipling that 'we've learnt to whittle the Eden tree to the shape of a surplice-peg' is not baseless.

(*c*) The third and most powerful note in these sermons is the sympathy of the preacher for those who, in one way or another, are 'up against it' and are still carrying-on with courage.

In our judgment this little book is not so important for its contents as for its spirit. It is direct, personal and sympathetic. It appeals to the man by the fireside as it does to the man in the pew. There is theology in the background—a good deal of it—but it is never allowed to take the place which belongs to religion. This is the secret of this preacher's success. He has found out that 'the greatest thing in the world' must be spoken of very simply.

Walt Whitman described the response made to the right voice thus:

> 'Whoso speaks to me with the right voice,
> Him or Her will I follow,
> As the waves follow the moon everywhere
> With fluid steps gladly round the globe.'

Some readers will feel an additional interest in this little book as its author is an old Ripon student. A.T.W.D.

WHAT A CHINAMAN THINKS ABOUT GOD.

Those who know little of Chinese religion, if asked to define the Chinese idea of the Supreme Being would reply: 'So far as I know the literate Chinese have no idea of God whatsoever: they concern themselves with moral philosophy, but regard theology as waste of time and energy: they do, however, pay divine honours to Confucius; and the Emperor, in the days before the Republic, used once a year at the great Altar of Heaven in Peking to offer worship, but whether the object of worship was a place or a person or a force or an idea, nobody seems to know. Of course all Chinese worship their ancestors, and the populace make offerings to grotesque little pot-bellied idols of jade and wood, who are believed to be able to bring luck and avert disaster.'

The Editor (Mr. Frank Rawlinson) of *The Chinese Record*, who has had many years of educational work in mission language schools in China, has collected from various sources, literary and oral, ancient and modern, Chinese thoughts about God, which he presents in systematized form in a little book entitled *Chinese Ideas of the Supreme Being*.* Besides its very varied collection of material, Mr. Rawlinson's *brochure* is valuable in indicating that there is much more correspondence between Chinese and Christian ideas of the Supreme Being than has generally been perceived and admitted. Whilst allowing that Christians can read too much into Chinese religious ideas and phrases, Mr. Rawlinson believes that there is at least an equal danger of reading too much out of them.

As there are four great 'religious systems' operating in China, *viz.* Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, and Islam; as there is the greatest difference between the religious outlook of the literate and illiterate classes, as there is the widely diffused influence of Christian mission teaching, the

*Second and Revised Edition, printed at the Presbyterian Mission Press, Shanghai, China. (1928.)

Nestorian going back to the seventh century, and the Roman Catholic to the sixteenth, it becomes extraordinarily difficult to say what is the Chinese idea of the Supreme Being. Some of the Chinese sayings formulated about God seem rather trite: *e.g.* 'Thou madest heaven; thou madest earth; thou madest man' (Imperial Prayer); 'Only God is impartial: on those who do good He sends down blessings; on those who do wrong He sends calamities' (Shu Ching); 'All I do is known to Him' (Emperor Ching T'ang). The author's summary is as follows:—

> 'Ideas about Him run all the way from a somewhat frigid fate to those of a warm, loving personality' (p. 59).

Mr. Rawlinson points out that 'Father,' the Christian title of God, has disadvantages in China. Confucius said: 'The noble man keeps his son at a distance.' That is hardly like the Father in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The intimate relation in China of pupil and teacher comes nearer the Christian conception of the relation of God to the human soul. Mr. Rawlinson in his valuable and interesting book records a saying by a modern Chinese literate, a non-Christian, which certainly deserves to rank with the axioms of the sages: 'If there be no God, then the universe has no ruler; if there be no God, then our souls have no place to which to return.'

H.D.A.M.

ENGLISH VERSUS ROMAN CEREMONIAL.

*The Parson's Handbook,** by Dr. Percy Dearmer, has reached its eleventh edition. It has probably had more effect in educating and restricting the ritualistic activities of the English clergy than any other English manual. It is full of information and full of good sense. We give an example:—

> 'THE CAP, the "square cap" of Canon 74, has gone through several modifications: once of the comely shape that we see in the portraits of Cranmer, Fox and others, it developed in the seventeenth century into the form familiar in portraits of Laud and his contemporaries (of limp material, with a tuft on the top), and then into the college cap in England, and abroad into the less comely biretta. There is no conceivable reason for English Churchmen to discard their own shape in favour of a foreign one—the use of the biretta offends an immense number of excellent lay folk, and thus makes the recovery of the Church more difficult.'

Those who like extreme simplicity in our services will not like Dr. Dearmer's book, but those who regard it as a profound mistake that our English ritualists should introduce Roman vestments and ornaments and ceremonies into our English churches will welcome Dr. Dearmer's book as a sincere and able effort to encourage English rather than Continental vestments and ritual. In a prefatory note Dr. Dearmer writes:—

> 'The vote in the House of Commons is a salutary reminder of the profound harm done to the Church by those unlawful practices which the *Parson's Handbook* has done its best to discourage.'

H.D.A.M.

TWO LITTLE BOOKS.

Canon Gamble, of Bristol, delivered three lectures this spring in Bristol University which attracted considerable attention and induced their author to consent to their publication.[1] They deal with the transformed conception of the idea of Deity, Authority, and Immortality. Like a good teacher,

**The Parson's Handbook,* by Percy Dearmer, D.D. (Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 11th edition. Price 10/-. 1928.)

[1] *The Traditional Idea of God.* Published by J. W. Arrowsmith, Bristol. Price 1/-. (1928.)

Canon Gamble is not afraid to begin at the beginning and to place lucidity before brilliance. We shall attempt neither to 'pot' these lectures for our readers, nor to criticize them, but to commend them. Many will find them very helpful.

Dr. Mellone has written a book of three chapters entitled *Back to Realities*, with the sub-title 'A Way Out of the Present Chaos in Religion.'[2] The first chapter deals with the condition of organized Christianity to-day, the second with the world's danger and the world's need, the third with Christianity in its simplest and most intelligible form. He asks: Shall England become Roman Catholic by way of the Established Church? Dr. Mellone is a Unitarian, and holds that there are only two ways of securing reunion—one by submission to traditional ecclesiastical authority as we have it in the Papacy, and the other by faith that our reason is given to us not to destroy itself but to be used, and so we must look to reason, conscience and experience as our guides to saving truth, and find our unity there. Yet, as he points out, the Roman Church makes use of reason too, great use, that in the end it may abrogate reason altogether. Whilst we are in agreement with the most of what Dr. Mellone writes, we should find ourselves much more in agreement with him if he were simply a whole-hearted fighter for truth and not also a propagandist of Unitarianism. The last sentence of his book: 'Are you a Unitarian without knowing it?' may secure adherents to the Unitarian body, but reduces the sympathy which we should otherwise feel with the single-minded teacher of truth.

ADVICE TO CLERGYMEN.

It is only right that the clergy whose business it is to give so much good advice should receive it with becoming humility. 'Give and it shall be given unto you' is an evangelical principle and a very beneficent one, when the giving is inspired by the best of motives. Of the four little books before us—*The Modern Parson*,[1] by Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Dean of Canterbury; *Pitfalls for the Parish Priest*,[2] by K.C.L.; *Ad Clerum*,[3] by Mr. Prideaux; and *Morals for Ministers*,[4] by R.E.X.—the first has most claim on our attention because we know how influential for good Dean Bell's ministry is proving. Dean Bell writes as a practical optimist, who believes that the work of the ministry is immensely worth doing and so tries to exhibit its beneficent and many-sided character. The volume abounds with useful information and sound advice. It contains a number of interesting literary references. We are glad to see an allusion to Father Mapple's sermon in *Moby Dick*. If any young man is thinking of Holy Orders we should strongly advise him to read this handbook to the subject—for such it is.

There is lots of good sense in *Pitfalls*. Pitfalls are not pleasant things, and to observe how young men full of zeal, piety and charity can be ensnared by them is rather depressing. But there is much else in this book besides descriptions of pitfalls.

Ad Clerum is a book of questions for self-examination. Francis Bacon wrote that a wise question is half its own answer. That is no doubt the purpose of these questions. Whether their use will help the user must depend upon his temperament. In the case of morbid men they would create a paralyzing depression.

[2] Published by Constable and Co. Price 2/-. (1928.)
[1] Published by S.C.M., 32 Russell Square, W.C.1. Price 4/-. (1928.)
[2] Published by Skeffington's. Price 2/6. (1928.)
[3] Published by G. W. Wardman, Letchworth, Herts. Price 1/-. (1928.)
[4] Published by Allen and Unwin. Price 2/6. (1928.)

Morals for Ministers contains much that is thought-provoking and is, in our estimation, more likely to promote effective self-examination than Dr. Prideaux's questions.

If we might add to the above, we would suggest a study of R. L. Stevenson's *Lay Morals.*

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

Annales d'histoire du christianisme (Editions Rieder. Paris: 1928). Under this title the papers read at the Congrès d'histoire du christianisme held at the Collège de France in April, 1927, in connection with the jubilee of M. Loisy, have been published under the direction of M. Paul Louis Couchoud in three volumes. They are of the first importance. Singly, the papers are the work of scholars of European reputation; collectively, they present the student with a view of the actual situation of sacred studies which is at once scientific and complete.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE INCREASING POWER OF THE BISHOPS.

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

Your comments on the increasing power of the Bishops seem to me to be sorely needed. May I give an example of this increase of episcopal power? The Diocesan Association of Lay Readers is controlled solely by the Bishop, who will not allow it to be discussed by the Diocesan Conference, nor will he allow its balance sheet to be sent even to subscribers. With difficulty I started a discussion on it at a Ruri-Decanal Conference, after the Rural Dean had informed us that the Bishop said we ought not to discuss it and that he would not be affected by any decision to which we might come.

In the course of these proceedings a remarkable development of episcopal power has been revealed through the constitution of the Diocesan Lay Readers' Association. The Bishop has conferred upon his officials in this organisation the right to interfere with the parish clergy in their parochial work. One of these officials, called a sub-warden, wrote and questioned me about my doings in my parish. This he appears to have done under the rules of the Lay Readers' Association, which are so interpreted that they confer on these officials the right of visitation—*e.g.* 'The Sub-Wardens shall be in constant touch with the Readers in their respective archdeaconries, and *subject to the direction of the Warden shall supervise their work.*' 'The Warden shall be directly responsible to the Bishop, and subject to the Bishop's direction he shall exercise general supervision over the work of the Lay Readers throughout the Diocese.' 'The Warden, the Registrar, the Sub-Wardens and the examiners shall be in Priest's Orders, and shall be appointed by the Bishop of the Diocese.'

Boiled down, this means that the Bishop has set up a clerical bureaucracy apart from the constitutional arrangement of Archdeacon and Rural Dean, with the right to interfere with the parish clergy by 'supervising the work of the Lay Reader,' and the conduct of this body must not even be discussed.

This adds weight to the opinion held by many that the power of the Bishops 'has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.'

HUGH LEGGE.

The Rectory, Newbold de Verdun.
23rd July, 1928.